



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

“But you said: ‘I will not serve!’”

The Interpretation of Prophetic Speech Quotations:  
A Case Study of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5

**Samuel Hildebrandt**

**Ph. D. Hebrew and Old Testament Studies**  
New College, University of Edinburgh  
February 2016

## **Declaration**

“This is to certify that this thesis has been composed by me and is entirely my own work. No part of this thesis has been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.”

Signed:

Samuel Hildebrandt

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract of Thesis.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Lay Summary.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter One - Prophets, Readers, and Quotations:</b>	
<b>A Methodological Prelude.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Introduction.....	9
2. The Foundations: Wolff, “Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch”.....	10
3. The Developments after Wolff.....	15
4. Back to the Basics:	
Overholt and the Problem of “Audience Reaction”.....	18
5. Quoted Speech in Current Jeremiah Studies.....	21
6. Conclusion and Outlook.....	26
<b>Chapter Two - Quoted Speech in Context:</b>	
<b>Method and Interpretation.....</b>	<b>29</b>
1. Introduction.....	29
2. Context and Definition.....	30
3. Context and Interpretation.....	33
3.1. The Dynamics of Quoted Speech.....	34
3.2. The Question of Authenticity.....	37
3.3. Conclusion.....	43
4. Context and Function.....	44
4.1. Dialogue.....	45
4.2. Drama.....	46
4.3. Demonstration.....	47
4.4. Characterization.....	49
4.5. Conclusion.....	50
5. Context and Communication.....	50
6. Context and Identification.....	53
7. Conclusion and Course of Analysis.....	58
<b>Chapter Three - In Search of a Framework:</b>	
<b>The Text and Structure of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5.....</b>	<b>65</b>
1. Introduction.....	65

2. Demarcation.....	67
3. Translation.....	69
4. Text Analysis.....	80
4.1. Jeremiah 2.1-3.....	80
4.2. Jeremiah 2.4-13.....	84
4.3. Jeremiah 2.14-25.....	87
4.4. Jeremiah 2.26-32.....	89
4.5. Jeremiah 2.33-37.....	90
4.6. Jeremiah 3.1-5.....	91
5. Conclusion.....	92
<b>Chapter Four - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.4-13.....</b>	<b>95</b>
1. Introduction.....	96
2. The <i>Irrealis</i> Insets.....	98
2.1. The Fathers did not say (2.6).....	99
2.2. The Priests did not say (2.8).....	105
3. Frame and Insets in 2.4-9.....	109
3.1. Structure, Address, and Reference.....	109
3.2. The Contribution of the Insets.....	114
4. The Context of 2.10-13.....	116
5. Conclusion.....	120
<b>Chapter Five - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.14-25.....</b>	<b>123</b>
1. Introduction.....	123
2. The Context of 2.14-19.....	123
3. Frame and Insets in 2.20-25.....	127
3.1. Frame and Inset in 2.20-22.....	129
3.1.1. "I will not serve" (2.20).....	129
3.1.2. The Images of Vine and Soap (2.21-22).....	135
3.1.3. Conclusion.....	137
3.2. Frame and Insets in 2.23-25.....	138
3.2.1. "I am not unclean" (2.23a $\alpha$ ).....	140
3.2.2. Imperatives and Metaphors (2.23a $\beta$ -25a).....	142
3.2.3. "I love Strangers" (2.25b).....	146
3.2.4. Conclusion:	
The Framing Dynamics of 2.23a $\alpha$ and 2.25b.....	149
4. Quotation as Structure and Dialogue?	
An Integrated Reading of 2.20-25.....	150
5. Conclusion.....	154
<b>Chapter Six - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.26-32.....</b>	<b>157</b>
1. Introduction.....	158
2. Frame and Insets in 2.26-28.....	159
2.1. Crime and Shame (2.26).....	160
2.2. The Triplet of Insets in 2.27.....	161

2.3. Conclusion and Transition to Judah (2.28).....	167
3. Frame and Inset in 2.29-32.....	170
3.1. Accusation and Discipline (2.29-30).....	170
3.2. The Inset in 2.31.....	173
3.3. Conclusion: YHWH's Lament (2.32).....	177
4. Quotation and Communication:	
An Integrated Reading of 2.26-32.....	179
5. Conclusion.....	182
<b>Chapter Seven - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.33-37.....</b>	<b>185</b>
1. Introduction.....	185
2. The Insets in 2.35.....	187
2.1. Phrasing and Perspective.....	187
2.2. Integration.....	190
3. The Frame of 2.33-37.....	192
3.1. The First Movement (2.33-34).....	193
3.2. The Insets in 2.35.....	197
3.3. The Second Movement (2.36-37).....	199
4. Conclusion.....	203
<b>Chapter Eight - The Speech Quotation in Jeremiah 3.1-5.....</b>	<b>207</b>
1. Introduction.....	207
2. The Frame of 3.1-3.....	209
2.1. Law and Lust (3.1).....	209
2.2. Exposition and Evidence (3.2-3).....	214
2.3. Conclusion.....	217
3. Frame and Inset in 3.4-5.....	218
3.1. The Frame of 3.4a.....	219
3.2. The Inset: Jerusalem's Appeals .....	221
3.3. The Inset: Jerusalem's Questions.....	226
3.4. YHWH's Response in 3.5b.....	229
4. Conclusion.....	232
<b>Chapter Nine - Reading Prophetic Speech Quotations:</b>	
<b>Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 and Beyond.....</b>	<b>235</b>
1. Introduction.....	235
2. The Discourse and Quotations of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5.....	235
3. Quoted Speech in the Book of Jeremiah.....	240
4. Quoted Speech in the Prophets.....	247
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>257</b>

## **Abstract of Thesis**

This thesis addresses the question of how to interpret instances in Hebrew prophetic literature in which one speaker quotes another speaker. Speech quotations of this kind occur almost 300 times across the prophetic corpus and exhibit a wide range of quoting and quoted participants with modal and temporal variations. In order to examine this phenomenon and to formulate a method for its interpretation, the thesis conducts an exegetical case study of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 which is distinguished by its high number and density of quotations (twelve instances in forty-two verses).

With a few notable exceptions, the phenomenon of prophetic speech quotation has not received any attention in its own right but was subsumed under other research concerns, such as prophetic conflict or the form-critical genre of disputation speech. Across these and other studies, the interpretation of quoted speech is marked by two principal procedures: a) on the basis of their assumed authenticity, quotations are frequently employed as a way to gain direct access to expressions of Israelite religion; b) in most studies, the approach to quoted speech is defined by extracting the quoted words from their literary environment and by assigning them to a fixed number of categories.

Prompted by the exegetical studies by Wolff (1937) and Overholt (1979), the thesis utilizes Sternberg's publications on quotation theory in order to confront these two central domains of authenticity and categorization. Quoted speech is defined as a dualistic structure in which the inset (quoted utterance) is subsumed under the frame (quoting context) in order to serve its perspective and rhetorical goals. The dynamics of the frame-inset relationship renders appeals to authenticity and direct access misguided: every quotation is subject to the forces of contextual mediation, influence, and shaping. The inseparable bond between frame and inset also challenges the approach of extraction and categorization. As a corrective to previous approaches, the thesis thus constructs the argument that prophetic speech quotations must always be interpreted within their literary context.

To demonstrate the accuracy and implications of this methodological discussion and argument, the remainder of the thesis analyzes the twelve quotations in Jeremiah 2.1-3.5. Special attention is devoted to the contextual integration of the quoted words and to the ways in which they are utilized to serve their frames. In close interaction with previous studies on this passage, this exegesis demonstrates the benefits of a reading that takes into account the contextually conditioned nature of prophetic speech quotations.

At the end of the thesis, the results of this analysis are summarized and related to other quotations in the Book of Jeremiah and other prophetic texts. The contribution of the thesis relates to the exegesis and understanding of the speech quotations and text of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 and the interpretation of quoted speech in prophetic literature in general.

## **Lay Summary**

This thesis is concerned with the question of how to interpret instances in the prophetic literature of the Hebrew Bible in which one speaker quotes the words of another speaker. The central argument of the thesis is that such cases of prophetic speech quotation must be interpreted within their literary contexts. In the opening section, the phenomenon of quoted speech is introduced and the passage of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 is identified as a suitable case study primarily because of its high count of quotations.

Chapter one gives an overview of previous studies related to prophetic quotations. In this review, it is demonstrated that individual instances of quoted speech have been studied primarily in isolation from their contexts. Moreover, the question of authenticity (did the quoted speaker really say these words?) is shown to have significantly distracted from the particular characteristics of the phenomenon and its literary contribution.

Chapter two defines what quoted speech is and how it works. On the basis of this discussion, it is shown that the question of authenticity is misguided and that the removal of quotations from their contexts disregards the essential nature of the phenomenon. The case for studying quotations in context is articulated and brought to bear upon the interpretation, function, communication, and identification of quoted speech.

Chapter three discusses the structure and textual units of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 and translates the passage. In this way, the chapter defines the context for each of the twelve quotations in this text and provides the first impression of their placement and interrelationship.

Chapters four to eight each analyze one or more quotations within the units that were established in chapter three. It is demonstrated that each quotation is deeply anchored within its environment in order to serve its rhetorical outlook and goals.

Chapter nine offers a summary of the quotation analysis of chapters four to eight. It discusses the role of the quotations in Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 and relates the insights that have been gathered in their analysis to other quotations in the book of Jeremiah and other prophetic texts.

The thesis concludes with a note on the interpretation of prophetic speech quotations.



## Acknowledgements

Above all, I want to express my gratitude to God the Father for his good and patient hand in my life, to his son Jesus Christ for finishing the work in whose comforting shadow I can pursue the lesser tasks, the Holy Spirit for guidance in all things. May what I have written honour you and serve your purpose.

It is not possible to express how deeply grateful I am for the love and support of my wife Darcy Ann Hildebrandt. Beyond her enduring care over the course of my writing, she has read the final dissertation in its entirety and has alleviated my readers from many overloaded Germanisms. Your eyes have proven to be as careful as they are beautiful, my dear.

I further thank my two beloved children, Sophie and Ezekiel. Our playtimes and adventures have taken my mind off my research many times and seeing you grow, laugh, and learn surpasses the value of “Papa’s book” in every way.

My parents and siblings likewise have played a vital role in the completion of this work. The last years have seen many meaningful conversations and time together which I remember fondly. I am also deep grateful for the support of my parents and sister from Darcy’s side. I want to especially acknowledge the influence of my father-in-law, Terry Piguët, whose “home-going” happened during my first year. Your testimony endures and I count it a privilege to have known you.

Special thanks goes to my supervisor, Dr. David Reimer. This dissertation owes so much to his sharp eyes and stimulating questions, and I treasure every one of our meetings and the much needed encouragement to “keep rowing” when the current seemed too strong. I also want to thank Dr. Anja Klein who, as my second advisor, has had an immense influence on the shape of the final product. My gratefulness extends to the rest of the faculty of New College, especially for the teaching and encouragement provided by Dr. Sean Adams, Prof. Hans M. Barstad, Prof. Paul Foster, Prof. Timothy Lim, and Prof. Nick Wyatt. I further like to recognize the support of the office, custodial, and library staff at New College without whom this dissertation would have not been possible.

I also thank Dr. Eric Ortlund for his help and friendship over the last years. Moreover, I want to acknowledge with deep gratitude the pivotal conversations at ISBL Vienna with Dr. Georg Fischer, Dr. Elizabeth Hayes, Dr. Karolien Vermeulen, and Prof. Richard Weis. The OTSEM network has also played a very influential role in my work and I am especially indebted to the feedback from Prof. Herrmann Spieckermann and Prof. Antti Laato.

The quality and joy of writing this dissertation would have been severely diminished without the company of my fellow researchers here at New College. I

am especially grateful for the shared time with Maryann Amor, Dr. Jason Atkinson, Eric Beck, Cory Brock, Joshua Coutts, Dr. Seth Ehorn, Dr. Whitney Gamble, JT Hewitt, Elijah Hixson, Dr. Taylor Ince, Daniel Jackson, Ray Lozano, Laura Mair, Teresa McCaskill, Catherine McMillan, Dr. Brad Penner, Benj Petroelje, Martin Ritchie, David Robinson, Alix Rouvinez, Dr. Julia Snyder, Steven Stiles, Gray Sutanto, and Luke Wisely. I am particularly thankful for the friendship and technical support of Dr. Andrew Kelley and Josh Mann. Special thanks goes out to Will Kelly and Dr. Kurtis Peters, my fellow Ugmen and co-founders of “Classickers.” I am also indebted to my friend Dr. Kengo Akiyama whose feedback on my draft I deeply appreciated.

In addition, I am thankful for the years at Duncan Street Baptist Church and the friends I made during this time. Ben Matthews and Justs Zarins deserve special thanks for their companionship. I will always remember our hours together with great joy.

## Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABL	Robert F. Harper (ed.), <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum</i>
abs.	absolute
AJBI	<i>Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANE	Ancient Near East(ern)
ANETS	Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentaries
ASB	<i>Austin Seminary Bulletin</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
ATSAT	Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BCOT	Baker Commentary on the Old Testament
BDB	F. Brown, S. Driver, C. Briggs, <i>The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BevTh	Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>Bi e Or</i>	<i>Bibbia e Oriente</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BSacr	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BTS	Biblical and Theological Studies
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CB	The Century Bible
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CEB	Common English Bible
cf.	compare
ch(s).	chapter(s)
CL	<i>Comparative Literature</i>
cons.	construct
cs.	common singular
CThM	Calwer Theologische Monographien

CUP	Cambridge University Press
DBI	Leland Ryken, James C. Wilhoit, and Tremper Longman III. (eds.), <i>The Dictionary of Biblical Imagery</i>
DCH	David J. A. Clines (ed.), <i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i>
DDD	Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst (eds.), <i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i>
ed(s).	editor(s); edition(s)
e.g.	for example
EJT	<i>European Journal of Theology</i>
ELB	Elberfelder Bibel (revidierte Fassung, 1993)
EOS	Editions Sankt Ottilien
ErIsr	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
Est Ecl	<i>Estudios Eclesiásticos</i>
ESV	English Standard Version
EvTh	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
f.	feminine
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FS	Festschrift
FzB	Forschung zur Bibel
GBS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
GKC	W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, A. E. Cowley, <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i>
GTJ	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
GUS	Gorgias Ugaritic Studies
HALOT	Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, Johann Jakob Stamm, and M. E. J. Richardson, <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HB	Hebrew Bible
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
Hi.	Hiphil
Hol	William L. Holladay (ed.), <i>A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
Hor	<i>Horizons</i>
HRD	Herder Bibel
HS	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
HSAT	Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching

ICC	International Critical Commentary
i.e.	that is (id est)
imperf.	imperfect
imptv.	imperative(s)
inf.	infinitive(s)
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JM	Joüon-Muraoka, <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JPhil</i>	<i>Journal of Philosophy</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSIJ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTL</i>	<i>Journal of Literature &amp; Theology</i>
K	Ketib
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KEH	Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
KJV	King James Version
KHAT	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
m.	masculine
MNK	Merwe, Christo H. J. van der, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, <i>A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar</i>
MT	Masoretic Text
NAB	New American Bible
NET	New English Translation
Ni.	Niphal
NIB	New Interpreter's Bible
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	Willem A. VanGemeren (ed.), <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i>
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i>
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs

OTMS	Old Testament Message Series
OTW	Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap
OUP	Oxford University Press
p(p).	page(s)
P&BNS	Pragmatics & Beyond New Series
part.	participle(s)
passive	pass.
perf.	perfect
<i>Phil. Per.</i>	<i>Philosophical Perspectives</i>
<i>Phil. Rev.</i>	<i>Philosophical Review</i>
<i>Phil. Stud.</i>	<i>Philosophical Studies</i>
Pi.	Piel
<i>PiL</i>	<i>Papers in Linguistics</i>
pl.	plural
<i>PT</i>	<i>Poetics Today</i>
PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
Q	Qere
<i>QJS</i>	<i>Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuaginta and Cognate Studies
SCL	Schlachter Bibel (2000)
SOTI	Studies in Old Testament Interpretation
sg.	singular
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
StudBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature
SubBib	Subsidia Biblica
ThB	Theologische Bücherei
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TLOT	Ernst Jenni, Claus Westermann, and Mark E. Biddle, <i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> .
TNIV	Today's New International Version
TNK	Jewish Publication Society Tanakh
TSL	Typological Studies in Language
TVZ	Theologischer Verlag Zürich
UBL	Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur
<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
v(v).	verse(s)
vol(s).	volume(s)
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>

VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WBG	Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft
WHS	Ronald J. Williams and John C. Beckman, <i>Williams' Hebrew Syntax</i>
WJK	Westminster John Knox Press
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WOC	Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O'Connor, <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i>
WuD	<i>Wort und Dienst</i>
YLT	Young's Literal Translation (1862 edition)
YUP	Yale University Press
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZB	Zürcher Bibel
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZKTh	<i>Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie</i>
ZThK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## Introduction

Why do you say, O Jacob,  
and speak, O Israel:  
“My way is hidden from the LORD,  
and my right is disregarded by my God?” (Isa 40.27)

Then I said: “Ah, LORD God! Here are the prophets  
saying to them: ‘You shall not see the sword,  
nor shall you have famine,  
but I will give you true peace in this place.’” (Jer 14.13)

Now many nations are assembled against you,  
saying: “Let her be profaned,  
and let our eyes gaze upon Zion.” (Mic 4.11)

At its core, prophetic literature is a record of quoted speech. The prophets are depicted as YHWH’s messengers who receive and repeat his words and address their audience on the authority of the attributive marker “Thus says YHWH.” While the dynamics of quoted speech thus underlie the very existence and empowerment of the prophetic books, they also occur widely in the discourse that they record. We encounter in these texts nearly 300 instances of one speaker quoting another speaker. The role of the quoting speaker is assigned most often to YHWH who repeats the words of the community, city, kings, prophets, and the foreign nations. There are, however, passages in which prophets or other characters quote YHWH, themselves, or one another. Alongside this diversity of participants, many speech quotations appear with curious introductions (e.g., they did not say; they will say; they said in their hearts) or in notable discourse positions, such as after prophetic sign acts or amidst laments. Other passages weave together various quotations, join them with other literary devices, repeat the same quoted utterance two or three times, or place the same phrase on the lips of different quoted speakers.



In light of this widespread and diverse attestation, the literary phenomenon of quoted speech in the prophets prompts closer attention. What exactly is a speech quotation, how does it work, and what parameters must be taken into account for its interpretation? As we will demonstrate in our opening chapter, prophetic quotations have seldom been approached for their own sake and on their own terms. Instead, they were subsumed under other concerns, such as the study of prophetic conflict, socio-religious inquiries, and various form-critical and redactional matters.

That the crucial issues of definition and dynamics have been attended to only sparsely or not at all has led to two central problems. The first problem relates to the question of authenticity which has dominated much of the scholarly discussion: did the quoted speakers actually say the words attributed to them or are they creative fabrications? With a few exceptions, most studies operate on an unfounded assumption of authenticity which in turn leads to inadequate appropriations of the quoted material as reliable, historical data. This misguided understanding of quotations as windows into the past often gives occasion to the second problem, namely, the failure to take into account the contextually conditioned nature of the phenomenon. The majority of studies that incorporate speech quotations isolate and extract the quoted utterances from their literary environment and force them into artificial systems of categorization.

In response to these procedures, the present study sets out to formulate and test a method for the literary analysis of speech quotations. Whereas the study of the prophets has always devoted a significant amount of attention to quotations between *books*—for instance, Jeremiah quoting Isaiah—the interpretation of quotations between *speakers* has received little recognition.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. The dominance of this analytical pursuit is reflected in the extensive review in Richard L. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (JSOTSup 180;

To this day, the relevant treatments are limited to Wolff's essay "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch" (1937), Overholt's study of Jeremiah 2 (1979), and Clark's unpublished dissertation on Ezekiel (1984).<sup>2</sup> Quotations across different books and quotations among speakers in one book exhibit similar dynamics, yet they elicit an entirely different set of questions, such as those related to dating, dependence, and composition. In marked contrast, our interest in prophetic quotations pertains to the domains of speakers, discourse, and communication.<sup>3</sup> For this reason, the phenomenon of prophetic speech quotation requires a separate investigation. Studies of this kind have been carried out for biblical narratives, wisdom literature, and the Psalms,<sup>4</sup> rendering a corresponding analysis of the prophets long overdue.

Inasmuch as filling this gap fosters a better understanding of prophetic literature, the primary contribution of our analysis lies in its corrective and constructive orientation. Challenging the hermeneutic of quotation outlined

---

Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), pp. 18-114. For a helpful overview of quotations, allusions, and other intertextual relations between prophetic books, see Willam A. Tooman, *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scriptural and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38-39* (FAT 2te Reihe 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 4-37.

2. Cf. Hans Walter Wolff, "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch: Eine Studie zur Prophetischen Verkündigungsweise" (BevTh 4. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1937). All references in our study are from the reprint in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ThB 22; München: Chr. Kaiser, 1964), pp. 36-129; Thomas W. Overholt, "Jeremiah 2 and the Problem of 'Audience Reaction,'" *CBQ* 41 (1979): 262-273; Douglas R. Clark, "The Citations in the Book of Ezekiel: An Investigation into Method, Audience, and Message" (Ph. D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1984).

3. The difference between these two kinds of quotations is already noted by Wolff, "Zitat," p. 47. On the ambiguity of the term "quotation," see further Schultz (*Parallels*, p. 172) and George W. Savran who has helpfully described quoted speech as a "subcategory of the more general term 'quotation'"; *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative* (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988), p. 7. Whenever "quotation" is used in the present study, it refers unequivocally to the phenomenon of speaker quoting speaker, to repeated and attributed speech.

4. Cf. Savran, *Telling*; Robert Gordis, "Quotations in Wisdom Literature," *JQR* 30 (1939): 123-47; *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 169-189; *Koheleth, The Man and his World: A Study of Ecclesiastes* (3rd ed.; New York: Schocken Books, 1968), pp. 95-108; Rolf A. Jacobson, *Many Are Saying: The Function of Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Psalter* (JSOTSup 397; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

above, our study will demonstrate the inseparable relationship between quotation and quoting context. We will argue that this relationship not only defines the phenomenon, but also determines its dynamics and the guidelines for its interpretation. The question of context also provides the necessary starting point for the debates about authenticity. Only if quoted speech is approached on its own terms can we venture any conclusions regarding its potential to provide authentic insights. On the basis of an assessment of previous studies and a methodological treatment, this study argues that no aspect of quoted speech can be adequately grasped, let alone analyzed, without detailed attention to the quoting context.

To argue in this way has immediate implications for the format of our discussion. Our emphasis on contextual integration demands, for instance, that we carefully consider the structural and literary configuration of each individual quotation that we treat. Rather than discussing a wide array of instances from different books, the discourse of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 has been chosen as a case study for our method and analysis.<sup>5</sup> This focus serves to protect our work from the pitfalls of superficial probing, yet more importantly, it brings to bear our questions and observations on one of the most important quotation passages in the prophets. This eminent position is due primarily to the density of quotations in 2.1-3.5 which amasses twelve instances across its forty-two verses.<sup>6</sup> The fact that Overholt's analysis of this text is widely cited in discussions of prophetic quotations prompts the question of whether or not 2.1-3.5 contains

---

5. We will refer to this passage throughout our study as "2.1-3.5." Every other biblical reference that is left unmarked refers likewise to the Book of Jeremiah.

6. Cf. Overholt, "Problem": "[Jer 2] has a higher density of quotations than any other chapter in the book"; p. 264. For texts with similar proportions, see, e.g., Mal 1 and Gen 24 and 44; cf. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, "Giving Voice to Malachi's Interlocutors," *SJOT* 19 (2005): 173-192; Savran, *Telling*, pp. 22-23; and my own study "The Proof-and-Play of Quoted Speech in the Joseph Story," in *Doubling and Duplicating in the Book of Genesis* (eds. Elizabeth Hayes and Karolien Vermeuylen; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, forthcoming).

representative value. Once our study of the passage has been completed, we will consider to what extent our observations are applicable to the remaining quotations in Jeremiah and in other prophetic books.

While 2.1-3.5 presents itself as a useful platform for demonstrating our approach and argument and for placing our contribution in line with previous scholarly works, the investigation of its quotations also promises important insights regarding the Book of Jeremiah. The proportions of quoted speech in 2.1-3.5 reflect the central role that the phenomenon plays across the entire book and especially in its opening chapters. Including YHWH's quotation of the prophet in 1.6 and the twelve instances in 2.1-3.5, the discourse of Jer 1-6 assembles over twenty-five individual quotations. Moreover, only eight chapters in the book go by without at least one quoted utterance (chs. 19, 24, 28, 39-41, 47, 52).<sup>7</sup> These figures and the book's total count of approximately 130 quotations stand in notable contrast to its counterparts of comparable length: Isaiah records less than seventy-five instances, contains twenty-eight chapters without a quotation and only nine quotes in chapters 1-10; Ezekiel includes roughly sixty-five quotations, has twenty-two chapters without a quoted utterance, and records a mere six quotes in its first ten chapters. While the phenomenon of quoted speech is a shared component across the individual members of the prophetic corpus, this comparative exercise identifies it as a distinctive literary feature of Jeremiah.

Our study of 2.1-3.5 makes three important contributions in this regard. First, it explores the role that quoted words play in the opening portion of the

---

7. It must be noted that some of these chapters are relatively short (chs. 24, 47) and that others are devoted to historical records which are less prone to include speech quotations (chs. 39-41, 52). On the difficulties involved in identifying the exact count of quotations, see "Context and Identification" in chapter two.

book. After the call of the prophet in chapter 1, the discourse of 2.1-3.5 records YHWH's first words to Judah and Jerusalem in the book and our understanding of this prominent address will only benefit from a better comprehension of its numerous quotations. Second, this study sheds light on the use and contribution of Jeremiah's other quotations and may reveal some connections between them and the twelve instances in the book's introduction. Third, our analysis adds a new element to current research ambitions regarding Jeremiah's speeches, dialogues, and polyphony.<sup>8</sup> As elsewhere in the prophets, the topic of quotation has been addressed mainly with reference to repetitions within the book or in relation to other books.<sup>9</sup> The exploration of the dynamics of one speaker quoting another speaker will complement existing enquiries into Jeremiah's discourse.

This study is structured along three interrelated parts. In chapter one, we will survey and assess previous studies of prophetic quotations with special emphasis on the Book of Jeremiah. This review forms the preface to the

---

8. In addition to the classical treatment by Hans Wildberger, *Jahwewort und Prophetische Rede bei Jeremia* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1942), see, e.g., John T. Willis, "Dialogue between Prophet and Audience as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Jeremiah," *JSOT* 33 (1985): 63-82; Margaret D. Zulick, "The Agon of Jeremiah: On the Dialogic Invention of Prophetic Ethos," *QJS* 78 (1992): 125-148; Mark E. Biddle, *Polyphony and Symphony in Prophetic Literature: Rereading Jeremiah 7-20* (SOTI 2; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996); Andrew G. Shead, *A Mouth Full of Fire: The Word of God in the words of Jeremiah* (NSBT 29; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2012); Robert P. Carroll, "The Polyphonic Jeremiah: A Reading of the Book of Jeremiah," in *Reading the Book of Jeremiah: A Search for Coherence* (ed. Martin Kessler; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), pp. 77-85; Joseph M. Henderson "Who Weeps in Jeremiah viii 23 (ix 1)? Identifying Dramatic Speakers in the Poetry of Jeremiah," *VT* 52 (2002): 191-206; A. R. Pete Diamond, "Interlocutions: The Poetics of Voice in the Figuration of YHWH and his Oracular Agent, Jeremiah," *Int* 62 (2008): 48-65; Naama Zahavi-Ely, "Voice and Persona: The Convention of Changing Speakers in Biblical Hebrew Poetry and its Use in the Book of Jeremiah" (Ph. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 2010); Karin Finsterbusch, "MT-Jer 1.1-3.5 und LXX-Jer 1.1-3.5: Kommunikationsebenen und Rhetorische Strukturen," *BZ* 56 (2012): 247-263; Samuel A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), pp. 258-272; Oliver Glanz, *Understanding Participant-Reference Shifts in the Book of Jeremiah: A Study of Exegetical Method and its Consequences for the Interpretation of Referential Incoherence* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

9. See, e.g., Geoffrey H. Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah: Doublets and Recurring Phrases* (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2000); Ute Wendel, *Jesaja und Jeremia: Worte, Motive und Einsichten Jesajas in der Verkündigung Jeremias* (BTS 25; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995); Jun-Hee Cha, *Micha und Jeremia* (BBB 107; Weinheim: Betz Athenäum, 1996); Georg Fischer, "Jeremia und die Psalmen," in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms* (BETL 238; ed., Erich Zenger; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 469-478.

methodological discussion in chapter two which addresses our research question. After a supplementary discussion of the function, communicative design, and identification of quotations, chapter two closes with a description of the course of our analysis by attending to the questions of approach (synchronic or diachronic?) and text (Jer-MT or Jer-LXX?). Chapter three provides the context for our analysis by presenting the demarcation and translation of 2.1-3.5, an overview of its structure, and the relevant context for each of its quotations. The five subsequent chapters analyze one or more quoted utterances on the basis of this preparatory discussion. Chapter nine offers a summary of this analysis and relates our observations about the quotations in 2.1-3.5 to other instances in Jeremiah and the prophets. The study concludes with a statement on the interpretation of prophetic speech quotations.



## Chapter One - Prophets, Readers, and Quotations: A Methodological Prelude

### 1. Introduction

The phenomenon of quoted speech is a prevalent element in the Hebrew Bible and throughout ancient and modern literature of various languages.<sup>1</sup> In the specific domain of prophetic texts, speech quotations have been approached from diverse research interests. This chapter offers an overview of this scholarly engagement with special reference to current studies related to the Book of Jeremiah. Since the central impetus in the study of prophetic quotations has come from Wolff's work and Overholt's analysis of Jer 2, we will organize our discussion around these two principal pillars. Wolff's pioneering contribution and the breadth of his analysis provide a valuable introduction to the phenomenon and also to the problems which mark its interpretation. Overholt has produced the key study of Jeremiah's quotations and his work informs much of our discussion. Combined with other relevant works from the period between them and from within current Jeremiah studies, the assessment of Wolff and Overholt thus comprises a vital foundation for the method and analysis advanced in the following chapters.

---

1. In addition to the contributions by Savran, Jacobson, and Gordis listed above, see, e.g., R. N. Whybray "The Identification and Use of Quotations in Ecclesiastes," in *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980* (VTSup 32; ed. J. A. Emerton; Leiden: Brill, 1981), pp. 435-51; Kenneth M. Craig Jr., "Bargaining in Tov (Judges 11.4-11): The Many Directions of So-called Direct Speech," *Bib* 79 (1998): 76-85. For quotations in non-biblical texts, see, e.g., Gordis, "Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature," *HUCA* 22 (1949): 157-219; "Virtual Quotations in Job, Sumer and Qumran," *VT* 31 (1981): 410-427; Johannes Friedrich, "Die Partikeln der Zitierten Rede im Achaemenidischen-Elamischen," *Or* 12 (1943): 23-30; Pamela Gerardi, "Thus, he spoke: Direct Speech in Esarhaddon's Royal Inscriptions," *ZA* 79 (1989): 245-260; Frank Kammerzell and Carsten Peust, "Reported Speech in Egyptian: Forms, Types, and History," in *Reported Discourse: A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains*, (TSL 52; eds. Tom Güldemann and Manfred von Roncador; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 289-322. For an overview of modern studies, see *ibid.*, pp. 363-417: "Comprehensive Bibliography of Reported Discourse").



## 2. The Foundations: Wolff, “Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch”

While there are sporadic references to prophetic speech quotations in earlier works,<sup>2</sup> Wolff’s contribution from 1937 lays the foundation for all subsequent inquiry. This eminent position is due both to the acumen and accessibility of his analysis and to its comprehensive scope. Not only does Wolff consider all of the quotations in the prophetic corpus, he also correlates his observations with quotations from the Psalms and includes a substantial discussion of theological aspects. We will confine ourselves here to those aspects which are most relevant to the interpretation of quoted speech, such as Wolff’s definition, identification, and categorization, his distinction between authentic and fictitious quotations (*Echtheit* vs. *Fiktion*), and his exposition of their contextual integration (*Anknüpfung*) and function.

In Wolff’s opinion, quoted speech refers to every “Einführung von Worten, die nicht als Jahweworte gekennzeichnet sind.”<sup>3</sup> Such words are introduced by *Einführungsformeln*—the so-called *verba dicendi* (e.g., אמר, קרא)—that serve to mark a quotation as quotation and to connect it to its context. Wolff takes special note of the variety and occasional absence of these markers.<sup>4</sup> Duly aware of the challenges that this scenario poses for the task of identification, he divides the quotations in the prophetic corpus into four categories:

1. “Zeugen für den Propheten” which appear only rarely.
2. “Stimmen der Gegner” which are predominantly antithetical.
3. “Dritte Stimmen,” (e.g., the man announcing Jeremiah’s birth [20.15]).
4. “Zitate künftiger Worte” which occur mostly in eschatological texts.<sup>5</sup>

These categories helpfully demonstrate the diversity of quoted speakers,

---

2. See, e.g., Herrmann Gunkel, “Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter,” in *Die Großen Propheten* (2nd ed; ed. Hans Schmidt; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. lxvii-lxviii. For examples of Rabbinic quotation exegesis, see Savran, *Telling*, pp. 1-3.

3. “Zitat,” p. 40

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-47.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-24.

attitudes, and temporal vantage points, but they also exhibit some difficulties. As a result of Wolff's narrow definition of "quotation ≠ word of YHWH," his taxonomy fails to include divine and prophetic self-quotations (e.g., 3.7, 19; 5.4-5; 7.32; Ezek 4.14; 9.8; 11.13) and instances in which YHWH is quoted by his prophet (e.g., 4.10; 32.25). Moreover, the use of two different organizational principles (speaker and time) and the breadth of the categories themselves undermine their analytical usefulness.<sup>6</sup> Finally, his explanation for the absence of the *verba dicendi* relies too strongly on the problematic equation between oral performance and literary representation.<sup>7</sup> Aside from these minor deficiencies, Wolff's treatment of the elemental aspects of quoted speech provides a helpful foundation. His systematic approach shows that any interaction with the phenomenon must begin with the crucial questions of definition, identification, and interpretation.

The importance of these questions, however, is quickly overshadowed in Wolff's work by his emphasis on the question of authenticity.<sup>8</sup> For Wolff, a quotation is authentic (*echt*) if it has been uttered prior to the prophet's speech and fictitious if it has not, or not yet, been uttered by the quoted speaker.<sup>9</sup> Based on this definition, Wolff discusses six quotations whose authenticity can be

---

6. For instance, the category "Stimmen der Gegner" includes people, other prophets, kings, and foreign nations. Future quotations (d) appear in Jeremiah often as antithetical structures (b), such as "they will no longer say X, but Y"; see, e.g., 3.16; 23.7; 31.29.

7. "Es ist der Sturm eifernder Rede, der die Einführung ausläßt"; *ibid.*, p. 47. It was common in Wolff's day to relate the peculiarities of some literary expressions to the prophets' passionate performance (see, e.g., Gunkel, *Die Propheten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917], pp. 29, 119). See, however, Terence Collins: "We have no means of checking to what extent, if any, the written poems accurately reflected the spoken words on which they were allegedly based. It is highly unlikely that the written lines would have been the result of straight transcription, a slavish reproduction of spontaneous utterances"; *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetic Books* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), p. 26; so also Biddle, *Polyphony*, pp. 120-128.

8. From the 113 pages of his study, Wolff devotes twenty to this question.

9. Cf. "Zitat," p. 28.

verified by comparison with other texts.<sup>10</sup> That none of these instances stands in complete (verbatim) agreement with the original utterance prompts Wolff to emphasize the element of prophetic freedom and to assume a sceptical position regarding the question of authenticity.<sup>11</sup>

This cautious assessment gains substance by those quotations which can be compared only in part (“frei zusammengesetzte Zitate”) and those which appear to be authentic but provide no means of comparison. Wolff suggests a set of criteria for this latter group (“vielleicht 25 bis 30 Zitate”) which may determine whether or not a quotation is authentic.<sup>12</sup> Some of his formal criteria seem more reliable than others: Wolff lists here quoted proverbs, songs, and prophetic self-quotes; yet, the rhythm of a quotation or the absence of a keyword connection hardly allows for a definitive decision.<sup>13</sup> The same problem comes to bear on Wolff’s content-related criteria. Just because a quotation relates to the thought-world of its environment, reflects the character of the quoted speaker, or is unintelligible in its quoting context does not rule out that it owes these aspects to imaginative and imitative rhetoric. This conclusion is reflected in Wolff’s evaluation of his criteria (“eine unbedingte Sicherheit ist in

---

10. Wolff discusses Hos 13.10/1 Sam 8.6; Am 5.14/Jdg 6.13; Jer 2.27/Pss 3.8; Ezek 20.5/Exod 6.7; Jer 26.18/Mic 3.12; *ibid.*, pp. 55-59. This collection is conspicuously small and exhibits some problems. In comparison, Savran detects among the 131 quotations in Gen-2 Kgs ninety-four verifiable quotations; cf. *Telling*, p. 19. Identical phrases in different texts cannot be labelled quotation when their temporal connection is unclear (so, for instance, Savran with reference to Amos 5.14/Jer 2.27; *Telling*, p. 8). Moreover, Jer 26.18/Mic 3.12 poses a special case because it entails a verbal parallel between two texts *and* a speech quotation.

11. “Wenn der Begriff der ‘Echtheit’ eines Zitates überhaupt aufrechterhalten werden soll, so muß er dahin eingeschränkt werden, daß er die völlige inhaltliche Übereinstimmung mit dem Wort des Zitierten, das wiedergegeben werden soll, meint. . . . Das zitierte Menschenwort ist der freien Gestaltung des Propheten durch den Zusammenhang seiner Verkündigung überlassen”; “Zitat,” p. 60.

12. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 63-68.

13. As we will show in the analysis below, the lack of contextual integration can have rhetorical reasons. For the problems with the concept of meter in Hebrew poetry, see David L. Petersen and Kent H. Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry* (GBS; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1992), pp. 37-42.

keinem Falle zu erreichen")<sup>14</sup> and comes to light fully in his discussion of fictitious instances:

Wir können ein Zitat erst dann fingiert nennen, wenn sein Inhalt entweder überhaupt nicht oder nicht im gleichen Sinne vom Zitierten vor dem Propheten ausgesprochen worden ist. Schon eine vorläufige Prüfung ergibt deutlich, dass der grössere Teil der Zitate in diesem Sinne fingiert ist.<sup>15</sup>

Wolff support this conclusion by highlighting the negative and conditional *Einführungsformeln*, the connections between quotations and their contexts—especially through verbal links (*Stichwortverknüpfung*)—and the self-accusatory content of some quotations (*Selbsturteil*).<sup>16</sup> What these characteristics indicate is confirmed in Wolff's view by those quotations which are set in a future perspective:

Die Zukunftszitate zeigen uns völlig, worauf uns auch schon die echten Zitate hinwiesen, die in ihrer Form nicht festzulegen waren: das Zitat unterliegt der Freiheit der prophetischen Verkündigung. Es ist ein Werkzeug, wahrscheinlich eins der bedeutsamsten, seiner öffentlichen Rede.<sup>17</sup>

In summary, Wolff's discussion advocates that prophetic speech quotation is by default a fictitious, creative tool employed in the service of rhetorical strategies. Particularly, the contextual integration and the outlook of the quoted words point in this direction and there are simply no reliable criteria by which to distinguish between authentic and fictitious quotations.<sup>18</sup>

---

14. "Keins davon ist ein notwendiges oder gar für sich schon zureichendes Erkennungszeichen der Echtheit"; "Zitat," p. 63.

15. Ibid., p. 43. Wolff states elsewhere (p. 68) that there are "kaum Zitate, bei denen jeglicher Widerspruch ausgeschlossen ist dagegen, daß sie vom Propheten erdichtet sind."

16. See *ibid.*, pp. 68-71.

17. Ibid., p. 50.

18. "Die objektive Unterscheidung—echt oder fingiert—ist uns weithin verschlossen";

Regarding the purpose of quoting, Wolff suggests a variety of reasons which might underlie its use, such as dramatization, clarification, irony, or dialogue. These features, Wolff proposes, make quoted speech a particularly well-suited device for convicting the prophetic audience of guilt and for moving them to repentance.<sup>19</sup> He next poses the question of integration with special reference to its theological implications: how can one call “Jahwewort und Menschenwort zusammen ‘das eine Wort Gottes?’”<sup>20</sup> In his view, the human words contained in the quotations are inseparably fused with the literary, structural, and thematic fabric of the divine words among which they occur. Quoted speech is thus subsumed under the aims of prophetic proclamation; it is “sekundär und dient der Applikation des Jahwewortes.”<sup>21</sup>

While Wolff must be commended for his helpful discussion of quotation and context, it is misguided to suppose that the secondary character of quoted speech always results in an antithetical construction, that is, that the quoted human words can only be used as a foil to be contradicted by the divine word (“Zitat ist nichts als Jahwe ablehnendes Widerwort”).<sup>22</sup> As we will demonstrate in our analysis, the perception of quoted speech as antithesis simply does not account for the wide range of contexts in which the phenomenon appears.

Even after this brief engagement with Wolff’s treatment, it is not difficult to understand why he has had such an enduring influence over the study of prophetic quotations. No other scholar has devoted such systematic and synthetic attention to this topic and nowhere else is the issue of authenticity

---

ibid., p. 74.

19. For this reason, Wolff locates the “stilgeschichtlichen Wurzeln der Zitationen” in the contexts of law and liturgy; see *ibid.*, pp. 85-90.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 74. “Es geht also bei der prophetischen Zitation um Verkündigung im kontradiktorischen Sinne” (pp. 94-95); “Der Sinn des Zitats ist Gegensatzbildung” (p. 97).

discussed with such care. Wolff has shown quoted speech to be a central element within prophetic literature and has demonstrated the extent and forms of its integration and the range of its purposes. He has convincingly argued that the question of authenticity, though for him decidedly tilted towards the fictitious side, must remain without a conclusive answer. Some areas of Wolff's work, however, require further development. His definition, analytical categories, and overall claim of antithesis all fall short of accounting for the diversity of quotations.

### 3. The Developments after Wolff

The decades after Wolff's study saw no further engagement with the phenomenon of prophetic speech quotations. Instead, his insights became a commonplace reference and were affirmed, for instance, in Westermann's account of prophetic speech forms and von Rad's theology.<sup>23</sup> While an interest in quoted speech re-emerged during the 1970s and 1980s, these endeavours were largely subsumed under other concerns and discussions. Whenever the phenomenon was addressed, it was only as a peripheral element in the pursuit of other matters.<sup>24</sup> Besides the study of irony<sup>25</sup> and form-critical matters, such as

---

23. Cf. Claus Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede* (BevTh 31; München: Chr. Kaiser, 1960), pp. 40-44; Gerhard von Rad: "Eine Frucht ihrer scharfen Menschenbeobachtung sind die häufigen Zitate, die die Propheten ihren Sprüchen eingefügt haben. . . . Man darf allerdings nicht erwarten, dass die Propheten auf eine objektive und loyale Wiedergabe bedacht waren. Oft haben sie verallgemeinert oder die Rede. . . ins Extreme verzerrt"; *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), p. 88.

24. This observation is shared by Clark: "Most references to citations in Old Testament scholarship over the past several decades have been general in nature and deal with them in the context of broader concerns"; "Citations," p. 5.

25. See, e.g., Sheldon Blank, "Irony by Way of Attribution," *Semitics* 1 (1970): 1-6; Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 119-121; James G. Williams, "Irony and Lament: Clues to Prophetic Consciousness," *Semeia* 8 (1977): 64-65.

the genre of disputation speech,<sup>26</sup> this development was apparent chiefly in the analysis of prophetic conflict. The most extensive integration of speech quotations in this domain appears in Crenshaw's seminal monograph which operates on the premise that

prophetic quotations are a veritable goldmine for information about the prophetic message and its impact. Indeed, the study of this material provides primary data about the obstacles confronted by the prophets and illuminates the thought-world of the masses.<sup>27</sup>

Evidently, the primary reason for Crenshaw's interest in prophetic quotation is its potential to illuminate the historical and socio-religious backgrounds for his analysis of prophets in conflict: "It is only as one becomes familiar with the voice of the people that he can understand false prophecy."<sup>28</sup>

Wolff's discussion of authenticity prompts a challenging question with regard to Crenshaw's valuation and use of quoted speech: if the prophets have fabricated the sentiments that they place on the people's lips, to what extent can they be used for historical reconstruction? Crenshaw is aware that "some of the

---

26. Due to the unrestrained use of the term "disputation," Adrian Graffy sought to determine "the missing criterion for assigning a text to the genre"; *A Prophet Confronts his People: The Disputation Speech in the Prophets* (AnBib 104; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1984), p. 1. This criterion, he argues, is found in Gunkel's original definition: "The name 'disputation speech' can worthily be given to those texts where an opinion of the speakers is explicitly reported by the prophet and refuted by him;" *ibid.*, p. 23; cf. Gunkel, "Schriftsteller"; see in the same vein, D. F. Murray "The Rhetoric of Disputation: Re-examination of a Prophetic Genre," *JSOT* 38 (1987): 95-121. Apart from some brief remarks in Graffy's final chapter, the phenomenon itself plays only a subordinate role in his work. The approach to quoted speech as a determinative element in the aid of a form-critical argument appears also in Burke O. Long, "Two Question and Answer Schemata in the Prophets," *JBL* 90 (1971): 130-138; Norman C. Habel, "Appeal to Ancient Tradition as a Literary Form," *ZAW* 88 (1976): 253-272; Delbert R. Hillers, "A Convention in Hebrew Literature: The Reaction to Bad News," *ZAW* 77 (1965): 86-90.

27. James L. Crenshaw, *Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971), pp. 21-22. Crenshaw had emphasized previously the need to "look at Israelite religion as it really was" and had described quoted speech as "a special source" to accomplish this task; "Popular Questioning of the Justice of God in Ancient Israel," *ZAW* 82 (1970): 392. He takes his cues from the work of van der Woude and Labuschagne; cf. A. S. Van der Woude: "Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-prophets," *VT* 19 (1969): 244-260; C. F. Labuschagne, "Amos's Conception of God and the Popular Theology of his Time," in *Studies in the Books of Hosea and Amos: Paper Read at the 7th and 8th Meetings of Die O. T. Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Africa* (A. H. van Zyl, ed.; Potchefstroom: Pro Rege, 1964-1965), p. 127.

28. *Conflict*, p. 24.

citations are obvious creations of the prophets themselves;” at the same time, however, he asserts confidently that “most of the quotations have a ring of authenticity that justifies their acceptance as genuine popular response.”<sup>29</sup> However, what these marks of authenticity are is nowhere defined in Crenshaw’s study, resulting in an approach that assumes rather than ascertains the factual character of the quotations. As he admits that some instances are fictitious but then selects quotations without probing their potential for authenticity,<sup>30</sup> his appropriation is, at best, inconsistent.

Similar assumptions of authenticity and direct access appear in the work on prophetic conflict by van der Woude and Manahan,<sup>31</sup> Blank’s treatment of irony,<sup>32</sup> and Horwitz’s source-critical analysis.<sup>33</sup> Clark’s handling of the issue is more sophisticated, yet his confidence that the quotations “reveal a great deal about the audience quoted” ultimately betrays the same problems.<sup>34</sup> Inasmuch

---

29. *Ibid.*, p. 34.

30. Crenshaw refers to Wolff’s criteria in a footnote (cf. p. 32) but never applies them to any quotation that he lists. See in this regard Savran’s review of Crenshaw; *Telling*, p. 9.

31. Van der Woude submits that Micah’s quotations contain “in all probability the very words of the pseudo-prophets” and that the “direct quotation from their words” yields “valuable, direct information”; “Pseudo-prophets,” pp. 246, 251, 257. For Ronald E. Manahan, Jeremiah’s quotations provide “insight into the religious views held by the general populace” and are a valuable help for finding “the principle by which a pseudoprophet could be detected”; “A Theology of Pseudoprophets: A Study in Jeremiah,” *GTJ* 1 (1980): 80-83.

32. “Quotations of this sort [i.e., Ezek 12.22, 18.2, 21.5, and 33.10] are of inestimable value to the historian; the historian could want no better evidence. . . They are not his [i.e., the prophet’s] words. These are the non-official voices—an authentic ‘documentary’—with the prophet reporting”; “Irony,” p. 2.

33. Horwitz sets out to determine whether the quotations are “the most contemporary and authentic report of the prophet Jeremiah that we have” or whether they are “untrustworthy for any historical investigation” (p. 555). Yet, he never answer this question but assumes throughout that “the reactions are genuine and have not been tampered with by later authors or redactors” (p. 564); William J. Horwitz, “Audience Reaction to Jeremiah,” *CBQ* 32 (1970): 555-564.

34. “Citations,” p. 312. Like Crenshaw, Clark is aware that “certainly some citations—all simulated ones and likely even some which, by all observable criteria, appear representative—are the product of Ezekiel’s (or his followers’) fertile and rhetorically sensitive mind” (p. 275). However, he does not provide a way to distinguish between the two kinds. In his overview of “simulated” and “representative” quotations, Clark has indicated that he is unsure of the status



as Crenshaw's troublesome appropriation of quoted speech is represented more widely, the structure of his analysis likewise emerges in other studies. Based on his survey of the prophetic corpus, Crenshaw assigns selected quotations to six distinct categories, such as "confidence in God's faithfulness," "doubt as to God's justice," or "historical pragmatism."

Similar to Wolff's taxonomy, this approach likewise exhibits Procrustean tendencies in that it advances a limited number of categories which overlap and create the impression that every quotation will fit only into one of them.<sup>35</sup> Whereas Manahan's five groups closely follow Crenshaw's approach,<sup>36</sup> Clark introduces four additional categories alongside Wolff's narrow antithesis, namely, explanatory, supplementary, divine self-citation, and prophetic self-citation.<sup>37</sup> This expansion, however, again fails to provide a workable system. Why, for instance, can prophetic self-citation not be antithetical or divine self-citation supplementary? Where exactly is the line between antithesis and explanation? And can all of the fifty-one quotations that Clark identifies really be assigned to these five fixed headings?

#### **4. Back to the Basics: Overholt and the Problem of "Audience Reaction"**

The study of quoted speech after Wolff has thus been characterized by three problematic aspects: 1) if there was any interest in the phenomenon at all, this

---

of nineteen of the fifty instances which he lists (cf. pp. 71-72). Furthermore, he concedes that some quotations that appear genuine may be simulated as well: "However, in the case of Ezek 9.9, 11.15, and 33.24 there exists no final way to demonstrate verisimilitude in spite of the fact that the sentiments expressed are by all counts representative" (p. 276).

35. For instance, the quoted devotion to tree and stone in 2.27 is listed under "Satisfaction with Traditional Religion" (*Conflict*, p. 27) but may fit also with the quotations that Crenshaw collects under "defiance" or "historical pragmatism." The lines blur also between quotations that give witness to "despair when hope seems dead" and those that express "doubt as to the justice of God."

36. Cf. "Pseudoprophets," pp. 89-94.

37. Cf. "Citations," p. 66.

was not by way of a systematic engagement but only in the service of other concerns; 2) Wolff's doubts regarding the idea that authentic quotations exist and can be detected was largely neglected. On the contrary, quoted speech was used indiscriminately to illuminate the historical and religious backgrounds of prophetic activity; 3) the interpretation of quoted speech was exercised on the basis of arbitrary selection principles and insufficient categories. As a formidable response to all three of these problems, Overholt's study begins with some very basic, but vitally important questions:

What do these quotations reveal to us? Of prime consideration here is the matter of authenticity: can we assume that in each instance some person or persons is/are being quoted, and if so, are the words reproduced accurately? By what criteria could such a question be resolved?<sup>38</sup>

Framing his article with these introductory remarks, Overholt sets out to examine the authenticity of the quotations in Jer 2. He discusses the form, structure, and theme of the chapter and detects some "patterns of usage which may serve as clues to 'authenticity.'"<sup>39</sup> In addition to the negative *verba dicendi* in 2.6-8 ("they did not say"), Overholt draws in this regard special attention to the ways in which quotations are connected to rhetorical questions. He highlights further the quotes' stereotypical language, contradictions, and logical inconsistencies,<sup>40</sup> and, reminiscent of Wolff's *Selbsturteil*, submits that they "uniformly present the people in a bad light."<sup>41</sup> In view of these observations,

---

38. "Problem," p. 263.

39. Ibid., p. 266.

40. The quotations in 2.23-29, for instance, are marked by "prejudicial and negative language," "stereotyped phraseology," and "a certain lack of logical development." The formulation of 2.31 "raises the question of the context in which such a quotation, if taken literally, would make sense"; "Problem," pp. 270-271.

41. Ibid., p. 266.

Overholt concludes that “the quotations were created or adapted by Jeremiah to fit his own polemical purpose.”<sup>42</sup>

Overholt’s analysis thus affirms Wolff’s discussion and mounts a corrective to the ways in which the phenomenon has been treated during the 1970s and 1980s. The significance of his work lies primarily in its focus on the context of the quotations. Since this factor had played such a central role throughout Wolff’s work (*Anknüpfung*), it is striking that none of the studies prior to Overholt have put much emphasis on it. On the contrary, the common analytical procedure was defined by extracting the quoted words from their environment and of grouping these isolated utterances under fixed categories. However, the marks of integration that Overholt has revealed renders this approach unfit for the phenomenon and, as a result, undermines the appropriation of the quoted utterances as direct data about the prophetic audience: “When studying the prophet and the social context in which he worked, we ought to beware of reading too much into a set of quotation marks.”<sup>43</sup>

The significance of context was brought up by Manahan and Clark, yet it is ultimately Overholt’s accomplishment to have directed the attention back to what Wolff had argued almost fifty years earlier. His study poses a serious challenge to the assumptions and agendas of previous, interpretive practice. There remain, however, a few aspects in his study which require more attention. Due to the number of quotations in Jer 2 and Overholt’s primary focus on the question of authenticity, his comments on the quotes’ location, interrelationship, and function are kept to a minimum. His approach to the issue of factual vs. fictional likewise leaves several questions unanswered. This is the case

---

42. Ibid., p. 270.

43. Ibid., p. 273.

especially regarding Overholt's conclusion which poses the "possibility of different levels of 'authenticity,' ranging on a continuum from verbatim quotation through paraphrase to outright fabrication."<sup>44</sup> With this balanced proposition Overholt laudably refrains from overstating his case, yet it implies that somehow there exists a way to determine where a quotation may be placed on such a continuum. Since he has laboured to demonstrate the literary integration and rhetorical usage of the quotations,<sup>45</sup> but then suggests that authentic instances exist and that they can be identified, the last word in the troublesome discussion of authenticity has not yet been spoken. The relationship between original and quoted utterances, the role of the quoting agent, and the dynamics of quotation deserve further attention.

## **5. Quoted Speech in Current Jeremiah Studies**

Completing our history of research and defining more specifically the place of our contribution, we will briefly review the developments after Overholt's analysis as exemplified in current Jeremiah studies. Similar to Wolff's work, the observations offered by Overholt established themselves as the central point of reference for all subsequent interpreters. Some of Overholt's successors have added significant insights beyond his discussion, yet the phenomenon itself has, as before, played only a subordinate role in the pursuit of other interests.

This tendency can be observed, for instance, in redactional approaches,

---

44. Ibid.

45. "Most [quotations] are such that they could have been said by someone on some occasion, but the tendency toward stereotyped language and conformity with the prophet's own views raises serious doubts about whether they actually ever were" (ibid). See further: "Since these quotations are used by the prophet (and his redactors) for his (their) own purposes and not collected for their own sakes, it is necessary to keep his (their) peculiar biases in mind when making judgments as to authenticity"; p. 264.

such as Herrmann's study of 2.20-28. In his view, this section consists of a poetic core layer (A) into which prosaic material (B) has been inserted. The B-material contains three speech quotations (cf. vv. 20a, 23a, 25b) which, according to Herrmann, were added to elucidate the terse poetry.<sup>46</sup> While Herrmann's redaction highlights the explanatory potential of the quotations in this passage, his analysis regards them only inasmuch as they concern his compositional arguments. The same can be said of Biddle's redactional treatment of 2.1-4.4 which calls attention to the organizing function of the 2fs-quotation refrain (תאמרי) in 2.20-37.<sup>47</sup> Beyond indicating this structuring role, Biddle's work does not address the phenomenon any further; it plays but a minor role in the pursuit of a redactional hypothesis.<sup>48</sup> Like the form-critical study of disputation speech and the socio-religious reconstructions of prophetic conflict, primary attention

---

46. "Durch Einführung dieser knappen 'Redeformel' gelingt es, in die Bildreden hinein, fast nahtlos, interpretierende Formeln zu schieben"; Siegfried Herrmann, "Jeremia: Der Prophet und die Verfasser des Buches Jeremia," in *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission* (new and updated version; BETL 54; ed. P.-M. Bogaert; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), p. 206. If the two layers fit "fast nahtlos" together, one wonders why this must inevitably indicate a redactional process rather than rhetorical design; see in this regard Marc Wischnowsky, *Tochter Zion: Aufnahme und Überwindung der Stadtklage in den Prophetenschriften des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 89; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), p. 122. Moreover, Herrmann's redaction rests on an unfounded differentiation between prose and poetry and an undue emphasis of the autonomy of the two layers: "Ein erstes Argument für die Selbständigkeit der unter B erscheinenden Aussagen scheint mir ihre kaum zu verleugnende Textgestalt in Prosa zu sein"; "Prophet," p. 206. For further critical engagement with Herrmann's study, see especially Martin Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea und Jeremia: Zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Hoseabuches* (CThM, Reihe A: Bibelwissenschaft 16; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1996), pp. 40-42.

47. Biddle, *A Redaction History of Jeremiah 2.1-4.2* (ATANT 77; Zürich: TVZ, 1990). Biddle postulates an original four-stanza composition with initial תאמרי-quotations (vv. 20, 23, 25, 35) which was complemented with the material of 2.5-13 and 2.26-32. The idea of a 2fs-core layer is adopted from Christoph Levin, *Die Verheißung des Neuen Bundes in ihrem Theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* (FRLANT 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), pp. 156-159.

48. Biddle builds his redaction on the assumption that different forms of gender and address point to different diachronic stages (see, e.g., *Redaction*, p. 31). That these shifts can, however, just as well be explained rhetorically is nowhere considered in his work. For this and other points of criticism, see especially the reviews by Jack R. Lundbom (*JBL* 110 [1991]: 515-17) and Winfried Thiel (*ThLZ* 116 [1991]: 104-105) and the assessment by Dieter Böhler, "Geschlechterdifferenz und Landbesitz: Strukturuntersuchungen zu Jer 2.2-4.2," in *Jeremia und die "Deuteronomistische Bewegung"* (BBB 98; ed. Walter Gross; Weinheim: Beltz, 1995), pp. 91-93. For Biddle's response to Böhler, see his *Polyphony*, pp. 51-55.

to how the quotations fit with this or that literary layer inevitably distracts from the quotations themselves.<sup>49</sup>

The decades after Overholt have generated three different surveys of Jeremiah's quotations.<sup>50</sup> This type of inquiry remains by its very nature synthetic and cannot provide a detailed treatment of individual quotations in their context. Nonetheless, there are several important insights to be gleaned from it. Manahan's comprehensive overview, for instance, presents a laudable improvement to the arbitrary selection of quotations in earlier studies.<sup>51</sup> Of special note in relation to Overholt's work is his emphasis on the quoting context.<sup>52</sup> In Trapp's survey, a helpful display of the various speakers and phrases, this particular emphasis is unfortunately absent. His overview thus exhibits some of the pitfalls of earlier contributions, such as the use of arbitrary categories and undue assumptions about the quotes' authenticity.<sup>53</sup> The third

---

49. Cf. Marvin A. Sweeney: "Attempts have been made to establish the literary structure of this text [Jer 2-6] and to examine the literary features, but such attempts have frequently been overly influenced by redaction-critical concerns that have hampered such literary analysis"; "Structure and Redaction in Jeremiah 2-6," in *Troubling Jeremiah* (JSOTSup 260; eds. Diamond, Kathleen M. O'Connor, Louis Stulman; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), p. 201.

50. Cf. Manahan, "An Interpretive Survey: Audience Reaction Quotations in Jeremiah," *GTJ* 1 (1980): 163-183; Thomas Trapp, "Jeremiah: The Other Sides of the Story," in *Was ist der Mensch. . . ? Beiträge zur Anthropologie des Alten Testaments* (FS Hans Walter Wolff; ed. Frank Crüsemann; München: Chr. Kaiser, 1992), pp. 228-242; Dalit Rom-Shiloni, *God in Times of Destruction and Exiles: Tanakh (Hebrew Bible) Theology* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2009; Hebrew title: אלהים בעידן של חורבן וגלויות תאולוגיה תנ"כית), pp. 58-113.

51. Horwitz, for instance, focused only on the quotation which agree with the prophet, Crenshaw paid attention only to those that disagree.

52. Manahan sees "the need for a method that is able to deal with the 'where' and the 'what' of these citations"; "Survey," p. 171 (emphasis original). Due to the limitations of his study ("space does not permit any extensive treatment of each quotation"; p. 179), Manahan resorts to topical categories (accusation, announcement, personal confrontation, and invitation). The differences between these groups, however, become quickly arbitrary and the multiple sub-categories which Manahan adds undermine the accessibility of his survey. Moreover, quotations from different contexts are grouped together under one category; for instance, all insets in Jer 2—except for 2.35—are listed under "Quotations as Confirmation," a subcategory of "Accusation" (cf. pp. 172-173).

53. Trapp's first three categories are "stereotypical words and expression," "laments and confessions of sin," and "declarations of trust in God or self." Some of his examples, however, fit more than one of these groups (e.g., 2.27; 5.19; 7.10; 23.17). As in Manahan's work, numerous

and much more elaborate survey forms a part of Rom-Shiloni's theology of exile. Reminiscent of Crenshaw's study, she is convinced that the "other voices" (קולות אחרים) besides the prophetic speaker provide an "open treasury" (אוצר גלוי) of reliable information.<sup>54</sup>

As an important deviation from Crenshaw's approach, however, Rom-Shiloni probes the methodological foundation of such a position. She identifies, as previously Wolff, obvious fictitious quotations (e.g., hypothetical or future saying, quotations of the nations, polemic quotations) and suggests criteria of "relative credibility" (מהימנות יחסית).<sup>55</sup> In explicit contrast to Wolff and Overholt, Rom-Shiloni concludes that prophetic quotes are often dependable and that it is possible "to isolate the ideas expressed in the quotations" (לבדוד את האידאות) (המבוטאות בציטוט).<sup>56</sup> At the same time, she is adamant that the question of authenticity cannot be answered in a general way, but that each quoted saying requires a separate analysis.

Rom-Shiloni's careful discussion far exceeds that of her predecessors. Her work is systematic, replete with helpful examples, and refrains from sweeping assertions and assumptions. Some of her criteria and conclusions, however, are not as certain as she claims: what counts, for instance, as a polemic quotation? When is a quotation deemed incongruent with its context? Why can a prophet not create a seemingly authentic quotation? Her "case-by-case" endorsement is laudable and she repeatedly draws attention to the quoting context; her interaction with the text, however, is in the end not much more than

---

sub-categories complicate and undermine the purpose of his categorization; cf. "Other Sides," pp. 231-233. Trapp submits that "some of the quotes are presumably exact, and some composed," yet there is no proposal of how to distinguish these two kinds (p. 230).

54. Rom-Shiloni, *God*, p. 58.

55. For instance, a quotation is reliable if it contains a popular proverb, is comparable to another saying in the same or in a different book, is linguistically unique, or is in some other way incongruent with its context (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 75-82).

56. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

yet another long catalogue of quoted utterances in categorical isolation.<sup>57</sup> Hence, while Rom-Shiloni's approach poses a significant step forward from the studies of Crenshaw, Manahan, and Trapp, her work contributes little to the understanding of prophetic speech quotation as a context-bound phenomenon.

In their search for "other voices," the studies by Trapp and Rom-Shiloni show affinities to the strand of Jeremiah studies to which we have referred in our introduction, namely, the analysis of the book's polyphonic intricacies. A forerunner of this research trajectory, Willis had discussed in 1985 some speech quotations in his work on Jeremiah's dialogues.<sup>58</sup> That quoted speech was predisposed to generate conversational patterns of this kind had been mentioned by Wolff and others,<sup>59</sup> yet due to the tendency to treat quotations in isolation, subsequent studies remained all too frequently blind to this characteristic. It may be for this reason that the phenomenon of quoted speech has received hardly any attention in studies of Jeremiah's voices and discourse, such as Biddle's foundational *Polyphony and Symphony* or Glanz's comprehensive study of referential shifts. Zahavi-Ely's recent dissertation "Voice and Persona" devotes a small section to the phenomenon, pointing, for instance, to its dramatizing effects and its capacity to articulate distinct perspectives and characterization.<sup>60</sup> Beyond these aspects, however, her work exhibits the same

---

57. Her discussion culminates in an appendix which lists all of Jeremiah's quotations and determines for each one the "kind of saying" (סוג האמרה; e.g., hypothetical), the "function in the prophecy" (התפקוד בנבואה; e.g., נאמנות), and the "theological standpoint" (העמדה התאולוגית); *ibid.*, pp. 89-108. This collection is broken down into several other charts (pp. 116-131).

58. Unfortunately, Willis' comments on the quotations are overshadowed by his emphasis on form-critical concerns and fails to move beyond assumed authenticity. Although he acknowledges Overholt's premise "that it is extremely difficult to determine with certainty" whether the quoted words are authentic or created ("Dialogue," p. 81), he is convinced that they "provide important insights into the thinking of the Jewish leaders and masses of Jeremiah's day" (p. 75).

59. See, e.g., "Zitat," pp. 85-87; Gordis, *Book of God*, p. 174; Long, "Schemata."

60. In her view, quoted speech "can grab the listener directly, either to agree or identify



problems of decontextualization and categorization that we have seen among previous interpreters.<sup>61</sup>

We conclude, then, that the last three decades have not seen much focus or advancement in the study of Jeremiah's quotations. Many of the commentators on Jeremiah 2 and a handful of literary studies have drawn attention to the quotes in this chapter, yet most of these discussions are brief and point back to Overholt's analysis.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, some publications whose topic and concerns may suggest a more intentional engagement with the phenomenon interact with it only in passing or not at all.<sup>63</sup>

## 6. Conclusion and Outlook

Having worked our way from Wolff's foundations to the current interest in Jeremiah's polyphony, we are now able to highlight some of the larger developments and problems of the study of quoted speech. The phenomenon

---

with, or to reject actively"; "Voice," p. 156. Zahavi-Ely further notes that quotations can "serve as pointers to the right attitude and behavior"; *ibid.*, p. 159.

61. The categories which she suggests combine texts from disparate contexts and quoted speakers. For instance, she lists 3.22, 16.15, and 31.17 under "hoped-for restoration." In the category "people's misdeeds," we find quotations of a feminine individual (2.25; 22.21) and a masculine group (6.16; 18.12).

62. See, e.g., Gary E. Yates, "Jeremiah's Message of Judgment and Hope for God's Unfaithful 'Wife,'" *BSacr* 167 (2010): 149-150; Mary E. Shields, *Circumscribing the Prostitute: The Rhetorics of Intertextuality, Metaphor, and Gender in Jeremiah 3.1-4.4* (JSOTSup 387; London: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 46-49; Diamond and Kathleen O'Connor, "Unfaithful Passions: Coding Women Coding Men in Jeremiah 2-3 (4.2)," in *Troubling*, p. 129; Henderson, "Jeremiah 2-10 as a Unified Literary Composition: Evidence of Dramatic Portrayal and Narrative Progression," in *Uprooting and Planting: Essays on Jeremiah for Leslie Allen* (LHB/OTS 459; ed. John Goldingay; London: T&T Clark, 2007), p. 128; Leslie C. Allen, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, KY: WJK, 2008), p. 47; Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard, *Jeremiah 1-25* (WBC 26; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1991), p. 36; Terence E. Fretheim, *Jeremiah* (SHBC; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), pp. 69-70, 74-75; Werner H. Schmidt, *Das Buch Jeremia: Kapitel 1-20* (ATD 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), pp. 89-90. After first mention, all commentators in this study are referenced by author last name only.

63. Although Rüdiger Liwak's work focuses on ancient rhetorical structures, the quotations occur not in his discussion; cf. *Der Prophet und die Geschichte: Eine Literar-historische Untersuchung zum Jeremiabuch* (BWANT 121; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987), pp. 186-202. The phenomenon of one speaker quoting another speaker is amiss also in Meier's encyclopediac treatment (cf. *Speaking*) and receives only a marginal reference in Finsterbusch work on Jer 1-3; cf. "Kommunikationsebenen," p. 255.

was recognized early on as a central component of prophetic literature and has attracted attention from a fair number of exegetes. For the most part, however, speech quotations were attended to not for their own sake but only in so far as they served other concerns, such as the analysis of form, redaction, sources, socio-religious aspects, and the literary and rhetorical criticism of recent decades. There have been plenty of studies *with* quoted speech, but hardly any study *of* quoted speech.

As the only substantial contributions that focused explicitly on the phenomenon, the works by Wolff and Overholt constitute the main pillars of its analysis and surpass all other studies in ingenuity and influence. Wolff's work has made the compelling case that interpreters cannot bypass the basics of what quoted speech is, how it works, and how it relates to its quoting context. All comments about its forms and functions and especially the difficult issue of authenticity must be preceded by an engagement with these parameters. If they are considered, the crucial dimensions of insertion, integration, and rhetorical shaping lead as in Wolff's case to a sceptical stance regarding the existence of authentic instances and the possibility of distinguishing them from fictitious quotes.

Wolff's foundations, however, had little impact on the interpreters after him. Motivated by the self-declared potential of quoted speech to illuminate historical and socio-religious backgrounds, prophetic quotations were selected *ad libitum*, taken out of their contexts, and subjected to some form of categorization. Overholt must be credited for confronting the wholesale equation between quoted words and original words as well as the treatment of quotations in isolation. The decades after Overholt saw no substantial advancement in the study of quoted speech. As previously, the phenomenon was

subsumed under other concerns or, as in the surveys by Manahan, Trapp, and Rom-Shiloni, only treated on a broad scale. Many interpreters have highlighted individual features, such as its structuring input (Herrmann; Biddle), its dialogical capacity (Willis), and its usefulness for perspectival formation (Zahavi-Ely), yet a specific analysis of quoted speech has not been conducted.

Given that Wolff's work sought to encompass the entire prophetic corpus and that Overholt's analysis was primarily structured around the question of authenticity, a number of questions deserve further attention. Most urgently, the basics of definition, dynamics, and identification need to be addressed: what is quoted speech, how does it work, and how can it be detected? The question of the interpretation of the phenomenon can only be answered on the basis of these fundamental aspects. Likewise, the troublesome issue of authenticity must be rooted in what quoted speech *is* and what information or access it can provide. Building throughout on the foundation of our survey and assessment, the following chapter will cover all of these aspects in a detailed, methodological discussion.

## Chapter Two - Quoted Speech in Context: Method and Interpretation

### 1. Introduction

The scholarly discourse about the phenomenon of speech quotation and the domain of quotation theory within which it is situated has seen immense expansion during the last few decades. Naturally, this development has generated many strands and queries which fall outside of the scope of our analytical concerns.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, many insights regarding speech quotations are gleaned from the analysis of modern languages and literature and cannot be applied indiscriminately to an ancient composition in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>2</sup> There is no reason to categorically deny that some of these studies may shed light on the quotation dynamics in ancient texts. Yet, at the same time, it remains difficult, if not impossible, to determine to what extent such a transfer is legitimate.

For this reasons, and also to increase the focus and accessibility of our

---

1. Intriguing in their own right, the analysis of quotations in the domains of philosophy or linguistics is of little relevanz for our study; see, e.g., Eun-Ju Noh, *Metarepresentation: A Relevance-Theory Approach* (P&BNS 69; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000), pp. 7-101; Niels E. Christensen, "The Alleged Distinction between Use and Mention," *Phil. Rev.* 76 (1967): 358-367; Corey Washington, "The Identity Theory of Quotation," *JPhil* 89 (1992): 582-605; François Recanati, "Open Quotations Revisited," *Phil. Per.* 22 (2008): 443-471; Paul Saka, "Quotation and Conceptions of Language," *Dialectica* 65 (2011): 205-220. The extensive debate about the relationship between direct and indirect discourse is not pertinent either; see, e.g., Ann Banfield, "Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech," *Foundations of Language* 10 (1973): 1-39; Michel Seymour, "Indirect Discourse and Quotation," *Phil. Stud.* 74 (1994): 1-38. Although attested in the HB, the indirect type is rare and occurs not in 2.1-3.5; cf. Shead, *Fire*: "Jeremiah's discourse, in common with all Hebrew discourse, almost never contains indirect speech"; p. 110; for more details, see Cynthia L. Miller, *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), pp. 93-142; The diversity of publications related to quotation theory is demonstrated in Güldemann and von Roncador's extensive bibliography (see reference above).

2. This caution also prefaces Schultz's chapter on "Quotation in Western Literature" (cf. *Parallels*, p. 181). For modern languages, see, e.g., Theo A. J. M. Janssen and Wim van der Wurff (eds.), *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb* (P&BNS 43; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996); Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech* (Trends in Linguistics 31; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986); Jean Weisgerber, "The Use of Quotations in Recent Literature," *CL* 22 (1970): 36-45.

study, we will restrict our interaction with the field of literary analysis primarily to the work of Sternberg. Probably best known for his analysis of Hebrew narrative art, Sternberg has also produced a number of studies which address the topic of quotation.<sup>3</sup> Since all of these contributions integrate biblical examples and have been shown to yield sound and fruitful insights when applied to biblical passages,<sup>4</sup> Sternberg's exposition provides a suitable and promising foundation for the analysis of prophetic speech quotations as well. We will employ his insights to formulate a definition of the phenomenon, describe its dynamics, discuss its interpretation, and engage the issue of authenticity. Closely connected to these central aspects, we will then address the domains of function, communication, and identification. The chapter concludes by describing the course of the exegetical analysis that will be conducted in the remainder of the study.

## 2. Context and Definition

What exactly *is* quoted speech? As we saw throughout our review, this basic question has received neither the attention nor the clarity which it demands. Wolff's definition, for instance, was found to be tied too closely to the identity of the speaker (quotation ≠ word of YHWH) and therefore is too restrictive. Other proposals, such as that found in Gordis' work, fail to convince for similar reasons. In his view,

the term 'quotation' refers to words which do not reflect the present sentiments of the author of the literary composition in which they are

---

3. Cf. Meir Sternberg, "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse," *PT* 3 (1982): 107-156; "Point of View and the Indirections of Direct Speech," *Language and Style* 15 (1982): 67-117; "How Indirect Discourse Means: Syntax, Semantics, Poetics, Pragmatics," in *Literary Pragmatics* (ed. Roger D. Sell; London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 62-93; *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987).

4. See, e.g., Jacobson, *Saying*, pp. 13-16; Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 27-29.

found, but have been introduced by the author to convey the standpoint of another person or situation.<sup>5</sup>

Fox has noted that this formulation is only valid on the questionable premise that every literary character in a given text speaks in accordance with the author of the text.<sup>6</sup> The more serious flaw of Gordis' definition, however, lies in the assertion that all quoted words stand in disagreement with the viewpoint of the author. While it frequently may not be possible to determine whether or not such a conflict exists, there is simply no reason to presume that quotations can only occur in opposition to their quoting context.<sup>7</sup> Another attempt to define the phenomenon appears in Manahan's survey:

A definition of quotation must include breadth enough for inclusion of both the author's direct citation of a speaker and construction of a 'composite quotation' to reflect truthfully the collective expressions and sentiments of the audience.<sup>8</sup>

Avoiding the problematic parameters of speaker and point of view, the distinction between direct and constructed quotations introduces an equally troublesome aspect. If a workable definition applies only to those instances which "reflect truthfully" earlier utterances, what should we say about the instances which Wolff and Overholt have identified as obvious fabrications? The preoccupation with the question of authenticity once more hampers the definition and analysis of the phenomenon.

---

5. "Literary Usage," p. 166.

6. Cf. Michael V. Fox: "It is important to remember that the speaker is not necessarily the author (R. Gordis's definition confuses the two)"; "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature," *ZAW* 92 (1980): 417; for further engagement with Gordis' definition, see also Fox's *Qohelet and his Contradictions* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), pp. 25-28.

7. Reminiscent of Wolff's notion of quotation as antithesis, Gordis' definition excludes, for instance, self-quotations and agreeable quotations.

8. "Survey," p. 167.

The proposals by Wolff, Gordis, and Manahan suffice to show that a definition must be articulated without any *a priori* judgments about certain characteristics of quoted speech, such as its relationship to the quoting context (antithesis) or to the original utterance (authenticity). Due to the limitations such judgments create and because prophetic speech quotation is available to us only as a literary phenomenon, a workable definition must be rooted first and foremost in the literary configuration of the phenomenon.

In this respect, all three proposals have drawn attention helpfully to the fact that quotation relies on insertion. It is an alien component within the dominant discourse and is only a part of it because it has been placed there from the outside. With regard to prophetic literature, which assigns most of its discourse to YHWH's voice, Wolff was thus right to attribute a secondary, interjected quality to such insertions.<sup>9</sup> Not necessarily in opposition to its context in every single instance, each act of quoted speech is in some sense foreign to its new environment. This example from Jer 2 demonstrates this basic characteristic:

כִּי מֵעוֹלָם שָׁבַרְתִּי עֲלֶיךָ	For in time past, I broke your yoke,
נִתְקַתִּי מִזִּמְתֶּיךָ	I burst your bonds.
וְתֹאמְרִי לֹא אֶעֱבֹד	But you said: "I will not serve."
כִּי עַל-כָּל-גְּבוּעָה גְבוּהָהּ	But on every high hill
וְתַחַת כָּל-עֵץ רֵעֵן	and under every green tree,
אַתָּה צֹעָה זֹנָה	you are bent over whoring! (2.20) <sup>10</sup>

In this verse, two separate utterances are brought into relationship with one another: the dominant flow of YHWH's speech, which opens and ends the verse,

---

9. For Wolff, "Zitat ist ein Eingeschaltetes" and has "Zwischeneinkunftscharakter" ("Zitat," pp. 38-39).

10. The printed Hebrew text in this study includes the vowel pointing as found in *BHS* in order to ease the differentiation between feminine and masculine forms. This will be of vital importance in our exegetical discussion. For the translation of 2.20, see chapter three and the analysis in chapter five.

and the embedded utterance that is attributed to his feminine addressee (“I will not serve”). In the technical discourse about quotation, these two elements are commonly described as the frame (the quoting context) and the inset (the quoted words) and we will refer to them with these terms in our study.<sup>11</sup>

In view of the problems that emerged from the definitions above, we will refrain from any further qualifications of these two elements, such as their respective speakers or perspectives, or the parameters of time and manner. Instead, we will work with a definition of quoted speech that is intentionally restricted to the most basic characteristic of the phenomenon, namely, the relationship between frame and inset. As a literary phenomenon, quoted speech is to be understood first and foremost as a correlation between two separate pieces of discourse, as a dualistic structure of framing context and embedded quotation, as speech-within-speech.

### **3. Context and Interpretation**

These initial remarks prompt us to attend next to the interrelationship between frame and inset: what are their respective characteristics, how do they relate to one another, and what is the outcome of this relationship?<sup>12</sup> In essence, we are asking how quoted speech *works*. As we apply Sternberg’s observations to this question, we will find that it bears a foundational significance for the question of interpretation and also for the long-standing issue of authenticity.

---

11. Cf. Sternberg, “Quotation-Land”: “It forms what I call an *inset* within the surrounding *frame* of the context-of-quotation”; p. 108 (emphasis original).

12. There is, then, an intriguing parallel to the phenomenon of metaphor and its dynamics between “tenor” and “vehicle” as first articulated in I. A. Richards’ “Interaction Theory of Metaphor” in *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London: OUP, 1936).



### 3.1. The Dynamics of Quoted Speech

Sternberg affirms the respective autonomy of frame and inset that was articulated by earlier grammatical treatments.<sup>13</sup> The quoting context and the quoted utterance constitute “two separate and independent events,” each with its own set of spatiotemporal, thematic, deictic, and syntactical characteristics.<sup>14</sup> Left without further qualifications, this description would justify the analytical process of extraction and categorization which has dominated the study of prophetic quotations. If the insets are autonomous discourse elements, they should be regarded on their own terms.

As Sternberg continues his exposition, however, it becomes apparent that the coalition of frame and inset creates a new whole which is much more than the sum of its parts. The phenomenon of quotation does not consist of a sequence of two isolated entities, but of two interrelated halves which in conjunction form one communicative unit. The act of quoting, of embedding one utterance within another, fuses frame and inset into an inseparable bond. This relationship, Sternberg contends, is far from egalitarian. As the result of its secondary, alien nature in the discourse and the inevitable effects of recontextualization, the inset is subsumed under the perspective and goals of the dominant frame which surrounds it.<sup>15</sup> The quoted words retain their autonomy on the surface level of syntax and deixis, yet as Sternberg observes, the framing of an element within a text entails a communicative subordination of the part to the whole that encloses it. However accurate

---

13. See, e.g., Barbara H. Partee: “The syntax of the embedding could hardly be simpler—a quoted sentence has exactly the form it would have as an independent sentence”; “The Syntax and Semantics of Quotation,” in *A Festschrift for Morris Halle* (Festschrift Morris Halle; eds. Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky; New York: Holt, 1973), p. 410. Cf. Miller, *Representation*: “The quotation of direct speech is syntactically and deictically *independent* of the frame”; p. 74 (emphasis original).

14. Sternberg, “Quotation-Land,” p. 107.

15. Cf. Sternberg, “Quotation-Land”: “As a necessary result of the subordination of part to whole, the local perspective of the quotee always subserves the global perspective of the quoter, who adapts it to his own goals and needs”; p. 109.

the wording of the quotation and however pure the quoter's motives, tearing a piece of discourse from its original habitat and recontextualizing it within a new network of relations cannot but interfere with its effect.<sup>16</sup>

This brief introduction to the basic structure and dynamics of quoted speech has important implications for its interpretation. Since the inset exists only as recontextualized discourse and since in this form it is always conditioned by the forces of integration and interference, the idea that quoted speakers speak with their own, independent voice can no longer be upheld. Autonomy, so Sternberg, is an attribute of the grammar of quotation, not of its communication.<sup>17</sup> YHWH's quoted addressee in our example above may speak from her own deictic and grammatical standpoint (i.e., first person singular), yet all the decisive parameters of her utterance, such as content, length, style, placement, and contextual relations are not in her control.<sup>18</sup> Quotation thus emerges not as the coexistence of two autonomous voices but as a "perspectival montage" between the voice and viewpoints of the inset and those of the frame.<sup>19</sup> Due to the communicative hierarchy between these two components, all the particulars of this montage are devised in support of the framing context. The direct speech presented in the inset is but an indirect element in the service of the frame's

---

16. "Quotation-Land," p. 108. See also Sternberg's "Point of View": "Quotation necessarily involves displacement, resetting or restructuring, contextual discrepancy and communicative control"; p. 77.

17. "From the fact that the inset is deictically independent of the frame, it does not follow that the inset enjoys communicative independence or inviolability"; *ibid.*, p. 111.

18. *Ibid.*, "Point of View": "The reporter always penetrates and colors the reportee's utterance, however, ostensibly independent"; p. 70. Overholt was thus entirely on the mark when he concluded that the quotations in Jer 2 "at the very least they give us his [i.e., Jeremiah's] view"; "Problem," p. 273. Wolff likewise recognizes that the quoted words partake in prophetic proclamation: "Es ist zu beachten, daß der Verkündigungscharakter auch noch den Ort im Prophetenspruch bestimmt, an dem nach seiner Natur zuallerletzt mit Verkündigung zu rechnen ist; denn im Zitat erwarten wir zunächst objektives Referat"; "Zitat", p. 84.

19. Cf. Sternberg, "Point of View": "Reported speech, regardless and often in defiance of grammatical distinctions, always presents a perspectival montage by virtue of the framing of the quote"; p. 77.

communicative design.

These observations notably affirm the contextual analysis that was advanced by Wolff and Overholt. Sternberg's work, however, goes further in that it demonstrates the full extent to which the quoted insets are subject to their frame. Beyond the tautology that there is no quotation without context, Sternberg makes a compelling case that quoted utterances cannot be understood adequately without corresponding investigation of their frames. Previous approaches to prophetic quotations, especially those centred on extraction and categorization, thus must be regarded as mistaken. Neglecting its basic definition, the disassembling of the frame-inset relationship creates an object of analysis that no longer resembles the structure that makes a quotation a quotation. Any inset that is cut off from its frame is but an artificial abstraction, neither recognizable nor functioning as that which it is described to be.<sup>20</sup>

If left intact, however, the configuration of frame and inset must be attended to as a dynamic whole. The lists and taxonomies of quotations have an obvious systematic attraction, yet they run counter to the very configuration that defines the phenomenon. Likewise, the attempt to gather "other voices" confuses grammatical with communicative autonomy and fails to recognize the dynamics inherent to the act of quoting: "to quote is to mediate and to mediate is to interfere."<sup>21</sup>

---

20. This hermeneutical procedure is a manifestation of what Sternberg has identified as the "tendency to read biblical texts out of communicative context, with little regard for what they set out to achieve and the exigencies attaching to its achievement. Elements thus get divorced from the very terms of reference that assign to them their role and meaning: parts from wholes, means from ends, forms from functions. Nothing could be less productive and more misleading"; *Poetics*, p. 2.

21. "Quotation-Land," p. 108. It is worth pondering to what extent this failure is related to the labels that interpreters have given to the phenomenon. For instance, the term "audience reaction" (cf. Horwitz and Manahan) implies a considerable degree of autonomy on the part of the quoted speaker: the prophet speaks, the audience reacts to his words. Conversely, the term "reported speech" suggests a mechanical, non-interfering role on the part of the quoting agent: the audience speaks, the prophet reports objectively; cf. Deborah Tannen: "'Reported speech' is grossly misleading in suggesting that one can speak another's words and have them remain primarily the other's words"; *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational*

### 3.2. The Question of Authenticity

As documented in the previous chapter, the question of whether prophetic quotations represent authentic facts or created fiction has been a thorny issue in the scholarly discussion. Although the quoted utterances of Israel's plebs, politicians, and prophets have frequently been employed for the reconstruction of socio-religious backgrounds, this question has not received the attention it demands. The widespread assumptions about authentic quotation, the inconclusive criteria that have been proposed, and the thoughtful yet troublesome continuum that stands at the end of Overholt's work make it necessary to address this issue from a different angle than previous exegetes. Continuing our discussion of the frame-inset dynamics, we will relate some of Sternberg's insights to the question of fact or fiction.

Sternberg's expositions were largely formulated as a critique of what he describes interchangeably as the "Direct Speech Fallacy," the "Reproductive Fallacy," or the "Representational Fallacy." His argument is directed against the traditional distinction according to which direct speech provides "an exact reproduction of a verbal communication" and indirect speech gives "a form of paraphrase."<sup>22</sup> The central problem, Sternberg asserts, lies with the unfounded equation between form and function:

---

*Discourse* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), p. 105. While "direct discourse" is the better option (cf. Jakobson and Meier) it must be kept in mind that this term is used primarily to distinguish direct from indirect utterances (cf. Miller, *Representation*: "The extent to which Direct Speech is 'direct' remains in the domain of the reporting speaker"; p. 143).

22. Sternberg quotes these statements (cf. "Indirect Discourse," p. 77) from Banfield, "Narrative Style," pp. 19-20, 30; *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* (Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), pp. 23-63. Other scholars who subscribe to this distinction are listed in Herbert H. Clark and Richard J. Gerrig, "Quotations as Demonstrations," *Language* 66 (1990): 795. Ultimately, Sternberg seeks to break down the rigidity of these categories and to establish in their place his "'Proteus-Principle': the same form may fulfill different functions *and* different forms the same function"; "Quotation-Land," p. 148 (emphasis original; Proteus is a Greek sea-deity capable of changing its form).

From the premise that direct speech *can* reproduce the original speaker's words, it neither follows that it must perforce do so nor that it ought to do so nor, of course, that it actually does so. . . . What the facts of communication establish beyond doubt is that this general claim is empirically as well as logically untenable.<sup>23</sup>

In Sternberg's view, any such claim overlooks the various forms of interference which accompany the framing process—selection, recontextualization, and communicative subordination—and which may extend even to the words themselves.<sup>24</sup> That the relationship between original and quoted utterance is not that of a one-to-one reproduction is signified also by a number of physical interferences, such as the unreproducible factors of intonation, style, and gestures, and also by linguistic and logical discrepancies.<sup>25</sup> Further demonstrating this crucial point, Sternberg turns to verbatim quotations, that is, to quoted utterances which can be compared to their original counterpart and agree completely with it. In Wolff's work and still in the criteria suggested by Rom-Shiloni, such instances had been declared to be authentic on the basis of the available means of verification.<sup>26</sup> Yet, as Sternberg points out, even identical utterances can express entirely different perspectives depending on their contextual integration.<sup>27</sup> To simply equate a quotation with the original fails to

---

23. Sternberg, "Point of View," p. 68 (emphasis original).

24. Cf. *ibid.*, "Point of View": "There is no level or aspect, down to the propositional content itself, that is immune against control and manipulation on the reporter's part"; pp. 68-69.

25. Sternberg points here, for instance, to "translational mimesis whereby Midianites (for example) speak pure Biblical Hebrew"; "Indirect Discourse," p. 78. He further makes the astute remark that in biblical discourse, "we are in effect invited to hypothesize a million-voiced chorus, comprising a whole nation ('all the people') and extending geographically, . . . all intoning in concert"; "Point of View," p. 95 (cf. Overholt, "Problem": "Indeed, one might ask what it means to 'quote' a group of people, anyway"; p. 273). Again in a different place, Sternberg exposes the assumptions which underlie the "reproductive fallacy": "Supposing for the sake of argument that each direct quoter were able and committed to provide an accurate (verbatim, opaque) transcript of the original, how could we tell whether he has acted accordingly? . . . Reproductionist theories seem to share the assumption that the reader, too, is omniscient"; "Quotation-Land," p. 142.

26. Cf. Wolff, "Zitat," pp. 54-60; Rom-Shiloni, *God*, pp. 75-76.

27. "In order to infiltrate and combine with an inset, the reporter need not tamper with its verbal makeup. . . . The frame not simply introduces and incorporates the displaced quote, but

notice the ever-present influence of mediatory interference and the contextually conditioned nature of words in discourse.<sup>28</sup>

These observations apply in significant ways to the question of authenticity. While biblical interpreters have commonly tried to address this issue by means of criteria or comparisons, no one has approached the question by asking what quotation *is* and how it works. If we begin, however, from the vantage point of the frame-inset relationship, it becomes apparent that the central problem lies not with the certainties that are attached to the quotations, but with the quest of authenticity itself.

What has been the underlying assumption of this quest is that all quotations fit one of two categories: either they are authentic and tell us something about extra-textual realities or they are fabricated and thus useless for historical inquiries. This binary differentiation, however, fails to account for the fact that no quoted inset ever gives a pure reproduction of its original utterance. Even if a quotation meets all the suggested requirements of authenticity, it is still subject to the “contextual mediation and superimposition of the framing perspective.”<sup>29</sup> If the forces of recontextualization and interference apply to verbatim, verifiable instances and to fictitious quotations

---

always colors and comments on it”; “Point of View,” p. 72. For another “argument against the verbatim assumption,” see Clark and Gerrig (“Quotations,” pp. 795-800), and Tannen, *Talking Voices*: “When speech uttered in one context is repeated in another, it is fundamentally changed even if ‘reported’ accurately”; p. 110.

28. Cf. Sternberg, “Quotation-Land”: “The uniqueness of a discourse rests less in its physical make-up as a sequence of sounds and words than of the contextual coordinates that give that sequence its meaning and function as an expressive structure. Accordingly, since in transmission the original context cannot be reproduced and a new context must be produced, even the most scrupulous transcript is doubly removed from the transcribed message or thought”; p. 130.

29. Ibid., “Point of View,” p. 73. See further Gilian Lane-Mercier: “The underlying assumption, of course, is that words are endowed with stable meaning, adhere directly to reality, and can be used to reproduce the already said”; “Quotation as a Discursive Strategy,” *Kodikas/Code Ars Semeiotica* 14 (1991): 201.

alike, we must conclude that both exist on the same conceptual and communicative level. Regardless of which side of Overholt's continuum an inset may be placed, every quoted word is mediated via the indirection of its new context.<sup>30</sup> The parameter of context has often been invoked as a *criteria*—almost all of Overholt's judgments on authenticity, for instance, are context-based—but no interpreter has given due attention to its *control*. Whatever the original meaning of a specific utterance may have been, it is decisively different in its new environment. It is, then, only possible to characterize a quoted utterance as "authentic" if it is regarded in abstract isolation from its quoting context and with no regard to the mediation that brought it into existence.<sup>31</sup>

But the quest for authenticity is problematic on an even more fundamental level. On the one hand, it is possible that a fictitious quotation may contain authentic elements. A polemic, non-verifiable caricature, for instance, can still provide a realistic impression of the quoted party. Even an *irrealis* quotation ("they did not say") can give evidence of an authentic failure of verbal activity. On the other hand, it is possible that a quotation which is verbatim and "verifiable" may be framed in such a way as to entirely reverse its original meaning.<sup>32</sup> Hence, if a fictitious inset can have authentic value and an authentic inset can be fictionalized, the line between authenticity and fiction is more fluid

---

30. Cf. Sternberg, "Quotation-Land": "Even if the original could be copied down to the last detail, its transplanting and framing in a new environment would impose on it a new mode of existence"; p. 108. Savran likewise speaks of "the power of context to transform the meaning of the quotation regardless of its fidelity to the original words"; *Telling*, p. 109.

31. Cf. Sternberg, "Quotation-Land": "Autonomous, nonnarrated, reporter-free, single-voiced quotation: each of these is a contradiction in terms"; p. 145.

32. According to Sternberg, the framing interference of verbatim quotations can "range from total endorsement to total dissociation"; "Point of View," p. 73. A case in point is the proverb that is quoted in virtually identical form in Ezek 18.2 and Jer 31.29 (Rom-Shiloni lists this instance as an example of an authentic quotation; cf. *God*, p. 75). However, as Paul M. Joyce has pointed out, "the two passages make very different points": in the frame of Jer 31, "the proverb paints an accurate picture of life"; Ezek 18, on the other hand, "asserts firmly that here and now the proverb is false and must not be used"; "Individual Responsibility in Ezekiel 18?" in *Studia Biblica 1978: I. Papers on Old Testament and Related Themes* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; JSOTSup 11; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979), p. 189.

than often thought.<sup>33</sup> In light of Sternberg's apt description of quotation as a perspectival montage, this observation should not be surprising. After all, if the phenomenon is a deliberate blend between original speech and quoting environment, it lies in the very genetics of quotation to incorporate *both* fact and fiction:

Each act of quotation serves two masters. One is the original speech or thought that it represents, pulling in the direction of maximal accuracy. The other is the frame that encloses and regulates it, pulling in the direction of maximal efficacy.<sup>34</sup>

Once these dynamics are recognized, all attempts to determine the truth-value of a quotation become just as misplaced as the analytical procedure which separates it into its respective components. A dualistic yet integral phenomenon, quotation simply will not operate in accordance with a categorical dichotomy that ignores its basic configuration. Original utterance and framing perspective have become one through the process of recontextualization and we can no longer determine where fact ends and fiction begins:

The inset is dominated and at will invaded by the surrounding frame. So much so, that only with effort and luck, if at all, can we reconstruct the original discourse from its image, decompose the perspectival montage into its elements, and distribute them among the various 'contributing' participants.<sup>35</sup>

---

33. Cf. Savran, *Telling*: "This relationship [between speaker and audience] is not a simple one of true and false telling. . . . A high percentage of quotations fall within this gray area"; p. 109.

34. Sternberg, "Quotation-Land," p. 152. Lane-Mercier concludes similarly: "Quotations pertain less to a dualistic logic opposing mimesis (authenticity, Truth) and innovation (inauthenticity, non-truth), than to a logic based on the continuous interplay of reproduction and construction"; "Discourse," p. 203.

35. Cf. Sternberg, "Quotation-Land," p. 109. Cf. Savran, *Telling*: "The meaning of a quotation is to be found somewhere between the original context and its quoted setting, drawing upon elements of both contexts, yet never fully aligned with either"; p. 111.



Since the question of authenticity relies on a mistaken dichotomy and takes into account neither the coexistence of fact and fiction nor the contextual interference that define the phenomenon, we must conclude that it is ill-construed and misleading. That a quoted utterance with reference to the past may contain some factual, historical element is not and cannot be denied;<sup>36</sup> yet, since prophetic speech quotations are available to us only in literary form and since each one of them is integrated within a distinct framing environment, the question that should receive our primary attention is how these quotations are shaped to serve their present contexts.

Instead of trying to dissect a structure that cannot be parted and instead of probing its indirect communicative design for direct answers it cannot give, the phenomenon of quoted speech should be approached and appreciated on its own terms. Subsumed under the communicative control of the frame, quoted speech operates simultaneously with the elements of reproduction and construction and it is precisely this blend of old and new, other and self, and fact and fiction that makes it such a versatile and powerful instrument.

### 3.3. Conclusion

From these observations it follows that the interpretation of prophetic speech quotations must move in a new direction. Similar to other areas of study in Jeremiah and the prophets,<sup>37</sup> the operations of extraction and categorization

---

36. Hans M. Barstad has highlighted this aspect with respect to prophetic literature in general: "Obviously, we cannot and should not regard these texts as 'historical' in the sense that they tell us 'what actually took place.' On the other hand, it is wrong to classify these stories as 'ahistorical.' Sprung from historical environments long lost to us, all of these stories *reflect* the historical and social surroundings that created them"; "No Prophets? Recent Developments in Biblical Prophetic Research and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy," *JSOT* 57 (1993): 53 (emphasis original).

37. See, e.g., Diamond's work in Jer 11-20: "Attempts to read the confessions apart from this context fail to interpret these texts in a manner which adequately considers the regulatory role of their contextual utilization"; *The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context: Scenes of Prophetic Drama* (JSOTSup 45; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987), pp. 184-185. Similar problems arise in treatments of the so-called servant songs in Isa 40-55; see here especially Barstad, "The Future

have all too often been motivated by research agendas which distort the basic configuration of the phenomenon. Its interpretation should not be structured around the analytical disassembly of frame and inset; on the contrary, it is precisely the *interplay* between these two pieces of discourse that deserves our full attention. While it is still of great significance what the inset articulates, its form, content, and perspective must always be analyzed in relationship to the context which surrounds and controls it: the frame reigns supreme.<sup>38</sup>

A direct inversion of previous approaches, the study of quoted speech must devote its primary attention not to the insets, but to their contexts: what framing perspective is established? What characterizations, questions, or accusations surround the quotation? At what point in a given unit is the inset placed and how is it framed in relation to other speakers and insets? What means of contextual integration are employed and how do they colour the quoted words? How does the context introduce, comment on, and relate to the quoted utterance? And finally, what communicative function is assigned to the inset by means of these framing operations? While each of these questions focuses on one specific aspect of the frame-inset relationship, all of them spell out the hermeneutical program that the phenomenon prescribes and which we will put into practice in our analysis of 2.1-3.5, namely, to read quoted speech in context.

---

of the 'Servant Songs:' Some Reflections on the Relationship of Biblical Scholarship to its own Tradition," in *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr* (FS James Barr; eds. Samuel E. Balentine and John Barton; London: OUP, 1994), pp. 261-270.

38. Cf. Sternberg, "Quotation-Land": "What the inset holds turns on the filling of the original, the premises and goals of the frame, and the qualifications of the reporting molds. . . . The supreme control lies with the frame"; p. 125.

#### 4. Context and Function

In light of this discussion, the frame-inset relationship obviously plays an important role with respect to the function of speech quotations. We noted at several places in our review that the functional taxonomies which had been proposed were too restrictive. Although Wolff's narrow antithesis was expanded in Clark's approach, his categories overlapped and required additional specification. The systems advanced by Crenshaw, Manahan, and Trapp likewise failed to account for the variety of quotations, leading to arbitrary divisions and various subcategories. Having now highlighted the formative role of the quoting context, it becomes apparent that the weakness of such proposals lies in their undue focus on the quoted insets. The fact that each quoted utterance is governed by its particular framing context creates a diversity and complexity which no categorical system will ever be able to capture. Consequently, there is neither one function, nor four, nor seven, but there are as many functions as there are framing contexts.<sup>39</sup>

This open-ended range of functions strongly suggests that we refrain from rigid categories altogether. Every frame-inset relationship is unique, hence, every instance needs to be analyzed on its own terms. At the same time, however, it is important to distinguish between those functions that are determined by the frame of a quotation and those which are generated from the basic dynamics between the part and the whole. These functions are, so to speak, a natural byproduct of the interplay of frame and inset, of its correlation of two voices, its guise of autonomy, and its potential to shape words and speakers. Solely as descriptive, heuristic guidelines, we will briefly introduce

---

39. Cf. Savran, *Telling*: "Quoted speech can be put to use in myriad ways"; p. 21. This statement is reminiscent of James L. Kugel's credo regarding the function of parallelism, the binary structure of Hebrew literature *par excellence*: "Biblical parallelism is of one sort, 'A, and what's more, B,' or a hundred sorts; but it is not three"; *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven, CT: YUP, 1981), p. 58.

four such areas: dialogue, drama, demonstration, and characterization. These domains are to some degree interrelated, yet each of them suggests important questions for our analytical endeavours.

#### 4.1. Dialogue

Several interpreters have drawn attention to the ways in which a quoted utterance can be employed in dialogical conversation structures.<sup>40</sup> For the most part, however, such discussions were subsumed under form-critical and reconstructive concerns which paid little attention to the frame-inset relationship.<sup>41</sup> If our observations are brought to bear onto the question of dialogue, the idea that the literary portrayal of a conversation provides direct access to historical scenarios becomes problematic. Whatever is verbalized and assigned to a quoted speaker is not an objective reproduction, but a construction subservient to the communicative strategies of the “responding” context. From this perspective, it is too restrictive to regard dialogues solely in terms of “thesis-antithesis” or “question-answer.” Instead, the syntactical and deictic guise of an autonomous speaker allows for all kinds of conversational scenarios. To capture these dynamics in our analysis, we must attend not only to the verbal interaction that is portrayed, but also to the relative length and balance of the speech proportions and the degree of connectedness between the speakers. We must further concern ourselves with the question of who is given

---

40. See, e.g., Wolff, Gordis, and Willis. For an overview of dialogue art in the HB, see Gordon (“Dialogue,” pp. 7-9). For dialogues in prophetic poetry, see Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (SubBib 11; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988), pp. 170-177.

41. Wolff, for instances, relates dialogues to a juridical (*Rechtsstreitgespräche*) or liturgical (*Wechselreden*) *Sitz im Leben*; cf. “Zitat,” pp. 85-90. Long sees the origin of dialogical question-answer schemata in the praxis of intercession; cf. “Schemata,” p. 136. Willis suggests that the “literary representations of these dialogues reflect actual events”; “Dialogue,” p. 75.

the privilege of opening the dialogue and who is given the final word.

## 4.2. Drama

Closely related to the dialogical potential of quoted speech is its dramatic or theatrical quality which was highlighted especially in Wierzbicka's work:

The person who reports another's words by quoting them, temporarily assumes the role of that other person, 'plays his part' that is to say, imagines himself as the other person and for a moment behaves in accordance with this counter-factual assumption.<sup>42</sup>

This analogy of role-play helpfully depicts the fusion of framing imposition and embedded utterance. If YHWH, for instance, quotes his people, it is still his voice and his perspective which informs their words; he speaks through them about them or to them.<sup>43</sup> By virtue of this communicative configuration, quoted speech can be used to produce dramatized discourse; it can create, correlate, and contrast different speakers. This imitation of real-life scenarios has the obvious benefit of enlivening the discourse but may also be used for other purposes.<sup>44</sup> Once quoted speech is understood on the basis of the frame-inset relationship and its functionality as a dramatic means is recognized,<sup>45</sup> several important

---

42. Anna Wierzbicka, "The Semantics of Direct and Indirect Discourse," *PiL* 7 (1974): 272. Cf. Coulmas: "Direct Speech is used as if the words being used were those of another"; "Reported Speech: Some General Issues," in *Direct and Indirect*, p. 6.

43. Cf. Tannen, *Voices*: "In the deepest sense, the words have ceased to be those of the speaker to whom they are attributed, having been appropriated by the speaker who is repeating them"; p. 101. Lane-Mercier submits that "reported speech relies on a strategy centered on the metaphorical death of the quotee"; "Discourse," p. 206. With reference to Jer 2, see Henderson, "Composition": "Israel's speeches are subordinated to Yahweh's speech with the phrase 'you [f. sg.] said' (2.20, 23, 25, 35). Thus the dispute is not technically a dramatic dialogue but rather a monologue in which Yahweh rehearses an earlier dispute with Israel"; p. 128. For Jer 8, see also Biddle, *Polyphony*: "YHWH speaks the entire unit. He cites the people in vv. 19b and 20"; p. 29.

44. For Wolff, the dramatization through quotations enlivens the prophet's speech and supports its clarity ("an Stelle abstrakter Ausführungen") and remembrance ("Behältlichkeit"); cf. "Zitat," pp. 75-78.

45. Cf. Sternberg, "Quotation-Land": "The spell of the reproductive fallacy once dissipated, we begin to see everywhere signs of indirection within directness, of narrative 'telling' within dramatic 'showing'"; p. 128.

questions emerge: how are the voices of YHWH and his quoted conversation partners related? Do their verbal strategies and attitudes change over the course of the conversation? How are the quoted speakers portrayed and how are they correlated or contrasted with the quoting speaker? What issues are discussed? Are they resolved or left open?

### 4.3. Demonstration

What underlies the dialogical and dramatic function of quoted speech is tied closely to its communicative action. Ever since Austin's lectures, the performative potential of words ("speech acts") has become an established element in the study of language.<sup>46</sup> Although some interpreters have indicated a possible connection between quoted speech and Austin's insights,<sup>47</sup> the complexity of speech act theory demands a methodological engagement which would exceed the boundaries of this study.<sup>48</sup> More appropriate for our purposes—Austin himself never mentions speech quotations—is the "Demonstrative Theory of Quotations" as introduced by Clark and Gerrig. In their view, there are three different types of communicative action, namely, indication (pointing at X), description (talking about X), and demonstration (re-enacting X). Description and demonstration are "fundamentally different

---

46. Cf. J. L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

47. See, e.g., Savran, *Telling*, pp. 14-15; Sternberg, "Quotation-Land," p. 146; Lane-Mercier, "Discourse," p. 208; Wierzbicka, "Semantics," p. 277.

48. Jim W. Adams has highlighted the problems of hurried applications of the theory to biblical texts; cf. *The Performative Nature and Function of Isaiah 40-55* (JSOTSup 448; New York: T&T Clark, 2006). See further Brevard S. Childs, "Speech-Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation," *SJT* 58 (2005): 375-392. In addition to Adams, helpful studies on prophetic speech acts are J. Gordon McConville, "Divine Speech and the Book of Jeremiah," in *The Trustworthiness of God* (eds. Paul Helm and Carl Trueman; Leicester: Apollos, 2002), pp. 18-38; Walter Houston, "What did the Prophets think they were doing? Speech Acts and Prophetic Discourse in the Old Testament," *BibInt* 1 (1993): 167-188.

methods of communication,” each with its own potential and goals:

What do people demonstrate? They demonstrate what in part it looks, sounds, or feels like to a person for an event, state, process, or object to be present. By depicting how a thing looks, sounds, or feels, they can refer to the thing itself.<sup>49</sup>

Clark and Gerrig submit that the communicative nature of quoted speech is demonstrative; it is a depiction of “what a person did in saying something.”<sup>50</sup>

Speech quotations have the capacity to create a direct perceptual experience of their quoted subject and allow for the “dissociation of responsibility,” that is, of saying one’s own words from behind the guise of indirection and attribution.<sup>51</sup>

With respect to these tenets of Clark and Gerrig’s work, the frame-inset relationship prompts the question of communicative differentiation: why does YHWH quote his addressees at a particular point in the discourse rather than speaking about them? How do referential, descriptive speech and quoted, demonstrative speech relate to one another? Also, what demeanor or action is demonstrated in the inset? Does it articulate something that would be inappropriate on the lips of YHWH? The answers to these questions depend, of course, on the shape of the communicative context in which any given inset is placed.<sup>52</sup>

---

49. Clark and Gerrig, “Demonstrations,” pp. 764-766. On the difference between demonstration and documentation, see also Gisela Redeker, “Quotation in Discourse,” in *Artikelen van de Eerste Sociolinguïstische Conferentie* (eds. Roeland van Hout and Erica Huls; Delft: Eburon, 1991), pp. 341-355.

50. Clark and Gerrig, “Demonstrations,” pp. 765-769.

51. “Many attitudes that are impolite or inappropriate for speakers themselves to express are quite acceptable in the mouths of others. . . . Quotations enable a speaker to convey information implicitly that it might be more awkward to express explicitly”; *ibid.*, p. 792. Cf. Coulmas, “Reported Speech”: “The speaker does not claim authorship for a part of his utterance”; p. 12.

52. Cf. Clark and Gerrig, “Demonstrations”: “When we hear an event quoted, it is as if we directly experience the depicted aspects of the original event. . . . Quotations should be useful for any purpose that is well served by such a direct experience”; p. 793.

#### 4.4. Characterization

The relationship between speech and characterization has been emphasized especially by Hebrew narrative critics, many of whom affirm the significance of the framing context. According to Bar-Efrat, for instance, a character profile is not simply the sum of all spoken words, but each utterance is intertwined with its contextual function.<sup>53</sup> Of special note in this regard is the timing of a character's speech,<sup>54</sup> the indirect characterization through the words of other speakers,<sup>55</sup> and the ways in which a character reacts—or fails to react—to questions, commands, and accusations.<sup>56</sup> While the frame possesses, ultimately, the supreme control over a character's depiction, the quoted words themselves deserve our attention as well. As Berlin has observed, speech is especially apt to “convey the character's internal psychological and ideological point of view.”<sup>57</sup> For this reason, we need to pay attention to the terms and phrases that are assigned to a quoted character: is the language defensive, engaging, or offensive? Are specific words or constructions repeated across several insets? Does the syntactical constitution of an inset indicate a character's disposition or suggest a

---

53. Cf. Shimon Bar-Efrat: “The content of a speech is closely connected with its function, whether this is to express emotion, establish an attitude, spur someone to action or provide information”; *Narrative Art in the Bible* (3rd ed.; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), p. 68. So also Jacobson, *Saying*: “Interpreting the character of the different people who are quoted in direct discourse in the Psalter, however, means more than simply lining up all the quotation insets. . . . Attention must be paid not only to what people say, but to whom they say it, the circumstances in which they say it, and what actions accompany the bare words”; p. 18.

54. Cf. Robert Alter: “The point at which dialogue first emerges will be worth of special attention, and in most instances, the initial words spoken by a personage will be revelatory, perhaps in manner more than in matter, constituting an important moment in the exposition of character”; *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981), p. 74.

55. See, e.g., Alter, *Art*, pp. 63-87, 116-117; Bar-Efrat, *Narrative*, pp. 64-65; Sternberg, *Poetics*, pp. 43, 342. Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), pp. 40-41. For examples of indirect characterization, see my study “The Servants of Saul: ‘Minor’ Characters and Royal Commentary in 1 Samuel 9-31,” *JSOT* 40 (2015): 179-200.

56. Cf. Bar-Efrat, *Narrative*, pp. 72-73.

57. *Poetics*, p. 64.



rhetorical strategy, such as, self-justification or denial?<sup>58</sup>

#### 4.5. Conclusion

As with the functional domains of drama, dialogue, and demonstration, these insights from narrative criticism can only be suggestive and must be judged case by case. All four domains may not be operative in every quotation passage and we can expect that one of them will be more readily recognizable than the others. In this regard, the questions which have been formulated at the end of each section will provide helpful guidelines for the analysis of 2.1-3.5. Turning now to two other areas, namely, the communication and identification of quotations, we will expand the technical foundations that inform our reading of quoted speech in context.

#### 5. Context and Communication

Evidently, there are numerous conceivable ways in which a quoted utterance may be connected to its context. The most obvious links are established through the *verba dicendi* (see below “Context and Identification”) and through shared lexemes. In 2.34-35, for instance, the frame accuses the addressee of destroying innocent lives (נָקִיִּים) while the inset declares innocence (כִּי נָקִיִּי).<sup>59</sup> Such explicit connections are, however, relatively sparse and the quotations are integrated oftentimes simply by their participation in the communication structures of their surroundings.

This interplay of quotation and framing speech can at times get quite complicated. With specific reference to Jeremiah, several interpreters have

---

58. Bar-Efrat points, for instance, to disjointed sentences which can “reflect mental or emotional states”; *Narrative*, p. 65.

59. Other keyword connections in Jeremiah and the prophets are listed in chapter nine below.

drawn attention to the complexity that arises from the levels of embedded speech that characterize the book's discourse.<sup>60</sup> Finsterbusch, for instance, has demonstrated that the first three verses of 2.1-3.5 depict three different levels of communication: the narrator presents the words of Jeremiah (וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי, v. 1) who then presents the words of YHWH as directed to himself (הֵלֵךְ) and to his audience (vv. 2-3).<sup>61</sup> Subsumed under this introduction, each of YHWH's quotations throughout 2.4-3.5 is thus embedded on a fourth level.

This scenario has two important implications for reading quoted speech in context. First, it highlights how essential the dynamics of quotation are in prophetic discourse. As already mentioned at the beginning of our study, the messenger format and the attributive phrase "Thus says YHWH" renders all records of prophetic speech as records of quoted speech. All of 2.1-3.5 is depicted as one long quotation of YHWH's words by his prophet Jeremiah. Yet, as indicated by the verbal equipment of Jeremiah in chapter 1 (וַיִּתְּנִי דְבָרִי בְּפִיךָ, v. 8), the heading in 2.1 (וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה), and the general "retraction of the prophetic persona,"<sup>62</sup> the prophet's speech is subsumed under YHWH's speech.<sup>63</sup>

---

60. See, e.g., Shead's sketch of Jer 27 ("labyrinthine complexity"); *Fire*, pp. 110-111; Christoph Hardmeier, "Probleme der Textsyntax, der Redeeinbettung und der Abschnittsgliederung in Jer 32 mit ihren kompositionsgeschichtlichen Konsequenzen," in *Syntax und Text* (ATSAT 40; ed. H. Irsigler; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1993): 49-79. H. Van Dyke Parunak has proposed a model of interrelated communication events in which the "committal" (YHWH to prophet) and "delivery" (prophet to people) are subsumed under the event of "report" (compiler to reader); "Some Discourse Functions of Prophetic Quotation Formulas in Jeremiah," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. Robert D. Bergen; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), pp. 493-494. According to Miller, embedding of direct speech within direct speech is "exceedingly common" also in biblical narrative; *Representation*, pp. 228-231). Meier points to a Neo-Babylonian letter (ABL 792.7-11) which evinces the same dynamics; *Speaking*, p. 320.

61. Cf. "Kommunikationsebenen," p. 250. See also Elizabeth Hayes, "'Hearing Jeremiah': Perception and Cognition in Jeremiah 1.1-2.2," *HS 45* (2004): 118.

62. Biddle (cf. *Polyphony*, p. 120) has adapted this phrase from Christopher R. Seitz, "Isaiah 1-66: Making Sense of the Whole," in *Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah* (ed. Seitz; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988), p. 121.

63. Cf. Shead, *Fire*: "The voice of the prophet is replaced by the voice of God"; p. 116. For the inseparable union of prophetic and divine voice and the subordination of the prophet, see already Wildberger, *Jahwerede*, pp. 103-105, 122-125. A. van Selms has shown in the narratives

While in 2.1-3.5 there is no question about the identity of the quoting speaker—YHWH speaks and quotes throughout the entire passage<sup>64</sup>—in other texts, it is necessary to attend closely to the placement and speaker of a quotation within the structures of embedding. This is the case especially when Jeremiah quotes YHWH's words back to him (4.10; 32.25), when YHWH quotes others *and* himself (e.g., 23.33-40), and when narrative dynamics correlate several different speakers and quotations (e.g., 32.1-8).

The second implication of the complexity of different communication layers relates to the quoted speaker and the audience to whom the quotation is addressed. Both Wolff and Savran have helpfully suggested a range of possible quotation scenarios: speakers may quote their own words to the person(s) they are addressing (X quotes X to Y), they may quote some previous words of their addressees back to them (X quotes Y to Y), or they can quote in their address, the words of someone else (X quotes Y to Z). Moreover, the quoted words may be either a rejoinder to the speaker's words or a referential statement.<sup>65</sup>

Obviously, these possibilities can create very complex communication scenarios; YHWH may, for instance, address Israel, then quote someone else and have that party likewise address Israel or speak about Israel or speak to himself

---

in Jer 40-45 that formulas such as "Thus says YHWH" bring about a "telescoped discussion." In Jer 45, for instance, three speakers and four speeches are "telescoped into one divine revelation"; "Telescoped Discussion as a Literary Device in Jeremiah," *VT* 26 (1976): 103. So also Biddle, *Polyphony*: "The final form of Jeremiah (MT) tends toward a depiction of the entire book as YHWH speech"; p. 120. Similar to Wolff, our study thus uses the descriptor "quotation" in 2.1-3.5 for words quoted by YHWH: "Das Ich Gottes ist im Stil des Botenspruches das rechtmäßige Subjekt der Rede. Die Begnügtheit des Propheten mit dem offenbarten Wort läßt ihn daher besser den 'Mundboten' Jahwes als den Zitierenden heißen. Den Namen des Zitates lassen wir um seines Zwischeneinkunftscharakters willen klüger für die Einführung anderer Stimmen aufgehoben sein"; "Zitat," p. 39.

64. Some exegetes ascribe certain portions to the prophet (see, e.g., Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20* [AB 21A; New York: Doubleday, 1999], p. 294; cf. Zahavi-Eli, "Voice," pp. 164-165). There are, however, no explicit markers to distinguish YHWH and Jeremiah: "Wie im ganzen Kapitel 2 immer nur Jahwe geredet hatte, beginnt auch Kapitel 3 zunächst mit einer langen Jahwerede"; Böhler, "Geschlechterdifferenz," p. 99.

65. Cf. Savran, *Telling*, pp. 24-25; Wolff, "Zitat," p. 53.

or about himself. In order to determine the communicative and dialogical dynamics of each inset, it is, therefore, of utmost importance to attend to the communication structures of address (speaking to) and reference (speaking about) that are indicated by the quotation and its context. We must discern in each case not only whom YHWH quotes but also if the inset speaks to the quoted party or about them or to someone else altogether.<sup>66</sup> The analysis of quoted speech must always go side by side with the analysis of prophetic discourse.

## 6. Context and Identification

As the final part of our technical discussion, we will now turn to the question of marking: how is the presence of a quotation indicated in the text and what guidelines can be suggested for its identification? Despite the wide attestation of the phenomenon across the prophetic corpus, answers to these questions are not as readily available as one might expect. The lack of attention to the basics of quoted speech may in part be blamed for this, yet the main reason, of course, is that Biblical Hebrew does not utilize a system of punctuation to signify shifts between speakers.<sup>67</sup> The only guidance at our disposal is the lexical, syntactical, and deictic configuration of the frame-inset relationship.

---

66. As Biddle has pointed out, these matters have not always received the careful attention they deserve: "From the text's perspective, who speaks? To whom? About whom or what? Jeremiah scholarship often falters at this most basic level of analysis"; *Polyphony*, p. 8. Biddle's contention applies, for instance, to Stuart MacWilliam's schema of Jer 2-3 which groups together "Addressee" [second person] and "Subject" [third person] in the same column; cf. "Queering Jeremiah," *BibInt* 10 (2002): 403. The need for distinguishing address and reference has been highlighted especially by Hardmeier, "Die Redekomposition Jer 2-6: Eine Ultimative Verwarnung Jerusalems im Kontext des Zidkijasauftandes," *WuD* 21 (1991): 21-22; "Geschichte und Erfahrung in Jer 2-6: Zur Theologischen Notwendigkeit einer Geschichts- und Erfahrungsbezogenen Exegese und ihrer Methodischen Neuorientierung," *EvTh* 56 (1996): 13-18.

67. Cf. Meier, *Speaking*: "The particular convention of quotation marks was a luxury not available to early Hebrew scribes"; p. 2. This poses difficulties also in the study of other ancient languages; cf. Gordis, *Book of God*, p. 169.

The most frequent and most reliable indicator of a speech quotation is the presence of a *verbum dicendi*. Representative of all other prophetic books, this role is assigned to the verb **אמר** in the majority of Jeremiah's quotations.<sup>68</sup> Albeit predominantly in finite forms (×45),<sup>69</sup> **אמר** also marks quoted speech in its non-finite manifestations. Three observations are noteworthy in this regard. First, the infinitive construct form **לֵאמֹר** is always accompanied by a finite verb. While this is to be expected, Jeremiah reflects a wide diversity of such verbs and even includes some that do not denote verbal activity (e.g., **רָפָא**, **בּוֹא**, **שָׂרַף**).<sup>70</sup> Second, all but one of Jeremiah's seventeen participle forms of **אמר** are used to mark a speech quotation.<sup>71</sup> Third, as in other prophetic texts, the imperative form is rarely used in this way.<sup>72</sup> In addition to other verbs related to speech,

---

68. According to Wolff, eighty percent of all prophetic quotations are marked by **אמר**; cf. "Zitat," p. 43. Jacobson has counted over seventy-five occurrences in the Psalter; *Saying*, p. 20. From the 478 occurrences of **אמר** in Jeremiah, 109 are used to mark a quotation.

69. Cf. Jer 1.6, 7, 11, 13; 2.6, 8, 20, 23, 25, 35; 3.7, 16, 19 [×2]; 4.10, 11; 5.2, 4, 12, 19, 24; 6.16, 17; 7.10, 32; 8.8; 10.19; 11.5; 12.4; 13.12, 22; 15.2; 16.10, 14, 19; 18.12, 18; 20.9; 22.8, 9, 21; 23.7, 17, 34; 29.15; 31.23, 29; 35.5, 6, 11; 38.25; 48.14; 50.7; 51.35. The finite forms of **אמר** that are used to mark quotations vary widely: **וַאֲמַר** (Jer 1.6); **אֶל־תֹּאמַר** (Jer 1.7); **וְלֹא אָמְרוּ** (Jer 2.6); **וְהִתְאֲמַרְוּ** (Jer 2.20); **לֹא־יֹאמְרוּ** (Jer 3.16); **אָמַרְתִּי** (Jer 3.19); **יֹאמֶר** (Jer 4.11); **יֹאמְרוּ** (Jer 5.2); **וְיֹאמְרוּ** (Jer 5.12); **תֹּאמְרוּ** (Jer 5.19); **וְאָמַרְתֶּם** (Jer 7.10); **וְלֹא־יֹאמְרוּ** (Jer 7.32); **וְאָמְרוּ** (Jer 16.10); **וְיֹאמְרוּ** (Jer 16.19); **וְאָמַרְתִּי** (Jer 20.9); **אָמַרְתָּ** (Jer 22.21); **יֹאמֶר** (Jer 23.34); **אָמַרְתֶּם** (Jer 29.15); **וְנֹאמֶר** (Jer 35.11); **תֹּאמַר** (Jer 51.35).

70. From the 116 occurrences of the inf. cons. **לֵאמֹר**, forty instances mark a speech quotation. The verbs that are combined with **לֵאמֹר** are **נָשָׂא** (Jer 4.10; 37.9); **רָפָא** (Jer 6.14/8.11); **בָּטַח** (Jer 7.4); **צוּה** (Jer 7.23; 11.4; 32.13; 35.6); **נָחַם** (Jer 8.6); **עוֹד** (Jer 11.7); **בִּקֵּשׁ** (Jer 11.21); **בָּשַׂר** (Jer 20.15); **נָבֵא** (Jer 23.25; 26.9; 27.16; 32.3; 37.19); **שָׂאֵל** (Jer 23.33); **שָׁלַח** (Jer 23.38; 25.4-5; 29.25, 28 [+ספרים]; Jer 43.2; 35.15; 42.20; 44.4); **אָמַר** (Jer 26.18; 27.9, 14); **דִּבֶּר** (Jer 44.25); **לָמַד** (Jer 31.34); **בּוֹא** (Jer 32.7); **פָּלַל** (Jer 32.16); **דִּבֶּר** (Jer 33.24); **כָּרַת + בְּרִית** (Jer 34.13); **שָׂרַף** (Jer 36.29); **שָׁמַע** (Jer 42.13-14). Only in Jer 2.35 (**אָמַרְדּוּ**) and 23.38 (**אָמַרְכֶם**) is the inf. cons. of **אמר** used as a subject. For the use of **לֵאמֹר** without another verb in Jer 3.1, see our analysis below. For an overview of other verbs preceding **לֵאמֹר** in the HB, see Meier's comprehensive treatment (*Speaking*, pp. 94-140, esp. pp. 99-100) and Miller's detailed, linguistic analysis (*Representation*, pp. 163-212).

71. The sixteen part. forms of **אמר** that mark speech quotations in Jeremiah divide into masculine singular (Jer 22.14; 44.26), masculine plural (Jer 2.27; 14.13, 15; 17.15; 21.13; 23.17 (together with the only inf. abs. of **אמר** in Jeremiah!); 27.9, 14; 32.36, 43; 33.10, 11; 42.13), and feminine plural (Jer 38.22). The only part. that is not used to mark a quotation appears in Jer 43.2.

72. This is already Wolff's verdict (cf. "Zitat," pp. 43-44). Jeremiah contains only ten impvtv. forms of **אמר**. The commands in Jer 13.18 and 18.11 are directed to the prophet and thus technically not quotations. Except for Jer 48.19 (**אָמְרִי**), all other forms are masculine plural (**אָמְרוּ**; cf. 4.5 [×2]; 31.7, 10; 46.14; 48.17; 50.2).

such as *דבר* or *קרא*,<sup>73</sup> Jeremiah utilizes verbs of thinking to introduce quotations (see, e.g., *חשב* in 11.19 and 48.2) or verbs denoting oaths, boasts, and cries.<sup>74</sup>

This diversity of marking is matched by the varying positions of the *verba dicendi* which most often occur before the inset, but can also stand after it.<sup>75</sup>

While these verbs are technical markers designed to connect frame and inset, we must not overlook that they are part of the framing context.<sup>76</sup> It may, for instance, be of interpretive significance if a quotation deviates from the common use of *אמר*, if different *verba dicendi* are juxtaposed within one unit, and if these verbs are modified by particles or conjunctions.<sup>77</sup>

Of special importance are instances which technically meet all the attributes of a quotation but which lack a *verbum dicendi*. Fox has suggested for these cases some criteria of “virtual marking,” such as the presence of “another subject besides the primary speaker,” or the occurrence of a “virtual *verbum dicendi*—a verb or noun that implies speech.”<sup>78</sup> Examples for the latter would be in the case of Jeremiah the noun *קול* or the verb *שמע* which both signal quoted speech in lieu of verbs for speaking.<sup>79</sup>

---

73. For *דבר*, see 20.8; 33.24; 42.19. For *קרא*, see 3.4, 19; 20.8; 31.6. In distinction to these quotations, Fox has noted that *קרא* appears frequently in so-called “naming formulas” (e.g., Jer 20.3: *לֹא פִשְׁחוּר קָרָא יְהוָה שְׁמִי*); see further 3.17; 6.30; 11.16; 19.6; 23.6; 30.17; 33.16; 49.29; for *קרא* + *שם*, cf. Jer 7.10, 11, 14, 30; 14.9; 15.16; 20.3; 25.29; 32.34; 34.15; 44.26; 46.17); cf. “Identification,” p. 425; cf. *DCH* 7:296-298.

74. See, e.g., *שבע* (Jer 4.2; 12.16); *זעק* (Jer 20.8); *ספד* (Jer 22.18); *נוד* (Jer 31.18); *בטח* (Jer 49.4). For other examples from the wider domain of prophetic literature, see Wolff, “Zitat,” p. 44.

75. In Jeremiah, *אמר* appears twice in postpositive position to mark a quotation (5.2; 51.35). For examples elsewhere in the prophets, see Meier, *Speaking*, pp. 50-57. For the varying positions of *verba dicendi* in biblical narrative, see Miller, *Representation*, pp. 212-217.

76. Cf. Jacobson, *Saying*: “The verbs of saying often interpret the inset”; p. 26.

77. See, e.g., Jer 2.23; 48.14 (*אִיד*); Jer 2.35 (*עַל־אִמְרֶיךָ*); Jer 5.24 (*בְּלִבְכֶם*); Jer 13.22 (*בְּלִבְכֶם*); for *אמר* + *כי*, see 5.19; 12.4; 13.22; 15.2; 29.15. See also *אמר* + *יען* (Jer 23.28).

78. “Identification,” p. 423.

79. The combination of *שמע* + *קול* appears in 3.21; 4.31; 9.18. The noun *קול* marks quotations in 8.19 (*קול שְׁוֹעֵת*) and 48.3 (*קול צִעֲקָה*). The verb *שמע* stands as a marker in 20.10 (with *דַּבַּת רַבִּים*) and 31.18. In 49.14, a quotation is marked by reference to an “envoy sent among

Clearly, this kind of marking must be discussed on an individual basis just as much as Fox's third criteria, the change in grammatical number and person. As defined at the beginning of this chapter, both frame and inset are syntactically and deictically independent from each other; a shift of a deictic marker, such as person (pronouns), time (temporal adverbs), or location (spatial adverbs) may thus signal the onset or end of an inset. Switches from one syntactical mood to another (e.g., imperative to indicative) and transitions of content or perspective may likewise serve to mark a quotation.<sup>80</sup>

In some cases, however, we cannot rely on these means of identification. A self-quotation, for instance, uses the same pronominal reference in the frame and in the inset (e.g., 3.7, 19; 20.7-10).<sup>81</sup> Other quotations may set the words of the speaker *and* the quoted party in past perspective or express both from identical, pronominal standpoints. These examples signify that the identification of speech quotations must be founded not exclusively on markers, shifts, and grammar, but always also on the careful examination of the context and content of a potential quotation. For this reason, it is not possible to determine the precise number of quotations in Jeremiah or any other prophetic book without a detailed discussion of all those passages which defy straightforward identification.<sup>82</sup> As with the questions of interpretation, function, and

---

the nations" (וְצִיר בְּגוֹיִם שְׁלֹחַ). For more examples of virtual marking in the prophets, see Meier, *Speaking*, pp. 32-37.

80. Cf. Fox, "Identification": "There are of course cases where the content of the passage makes it unmistakably clear that the speaking voice has shifted, as when a prophet (or God) quotes the people's words of penitence"; pp. 419-420.

81. This has been pointed out, for instance, by Jacobson (cf. *Saying*, pp. 22-24) and Fox, "Identification," pp. 425-426.

82. In 6.17a, for instance, is it unclear whether or not the phrase וְהָקַמְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם צָפִים signals that the rest of the line is a quotation. Many exegetes and translations answer in the affirmative and some even add a *verbum dicendi* (see, e.g., Carroll, p. 199; Holladay, p. 218; NRSV, JPS, TNIV, KJV, NET, ESV, ELB). Several other interpreters, however, do not think that virtual marking is at work; see, e.g., Lundbom, p. 432; William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah: Volume I* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), p. 148; Gunther Wanke, *Jeremia: Teilband 1 (Jeremia 1.1-25.14)* (ZBK; Zürich: TVZ, 1995), p. 82. In view of our discussion, Overholt's estimate ("approximately 100"; "Problem," p. 262) is certainly too low. The counts

communication, the question of identification likewise highlights the need to study quoted speech in context.

### **Excursus: The Difference between Quoted Speech and Poetic Voice**

These observations and the definition at the beginning of this chapter indicate that many instances which interpreters have previously described as speech quotations should be regarded more accurately as voices. The first-person speech in 4.19-21 provides a good example of this distinction. Although it meets all the deictic and syntactic criteria of a quotation, it notably lacks a *verbum dicendi* and shows no signs of virtual marking or any other indicators of insertion or attribution. In their particular contextual setting, these verses do not constitute an instance of *quoted* speech. Rather, 4.19-21 is one of many passages in which a character enters on his or her own terms into dialogue with other characters—here in response to YHWH’s announcement of judgment in 4.11-18.<sup>83</sup> Due to the absence of markers and the fundamental difference in communicative configuration—a quotation is an attributed utterance integrated into someone else’s speech, a voice is an autonomous utterance—texts such as 4.19-21 need to be recognized as a speech type in their own right and with their

---

given by Rom-Shiloni (×136; listed in *God*, pp. 89-108) and Clark (×140; cf. “Citations,” p. 69) are closer to the actual count of quotations in Jeremiah.

83. Cf. Fox, “Identification”: “The identification of the speakers in dialogue is a different matter from the identification of quotations. In dialogue neither voice is subordinate to the other. . . . The lovers in the Song of Songs, for example, are not being quoted—they *are* the primary speakers”; p. 426 (emphasis original). Robert P. Gordon refers to such voices as “unrubricated dialogue”; “Dialogue and Disputation in the Targum to the Prophets,” *JSS* 39 (1994): 7. The phenomenon of unmarked voices in dialogue appears also in Ugaritic; cf. W. G. E. Watson, “Abrupt Speech in Ugaritic Narrative Verse,” *UF* 22 (1990): 415-420; “Introductions to Speech in Ugaritic and Hebrew,” in *Ugarit and the Bible* (UBL; eds. George J. Brooke, Adrian H. W. Curtis, John F. Healey; Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 1994), pp. 383-393.



own particular dynamics.<sup>84</sup>

## 7. Conclusion and Course of Analysis

We began our methodological discussion in this chapter by defining quoted speech as a phenomenon which, although dualistic in nature, operates by means of integration, subordination, and montage: what ultimately makes and moves speech quotation is the control that the quoting context asserts over the recontextualized utterance which it embeds. The frame reigns supreme, shaping and utilizing the inset however it suits its communicative goals. This context-bound nature of quotation, we argued, undermines interpretive agendas which revolve around extraction and categorization and challenges the assumptions underlying the question of authenticity. The study of quoted speech must not be defined by these procedures but instead seek to determine the contribution that every inset plays within its unique, literary surroundings.

The case for reading quotations in context has been reinforced by our discussion of the phenomenon's functional dimensions, its integration within prophetic communication structures, and its parameters of identification. Rather than as a merely obligatory preface to our analysis, the engagement with

---

84. The failure to distinguish between quotations and voices often appears in categorical lists. Crenshaw, for instance, combines the quotations in 2.27 and 18.12 and the voice in 8.20 (cf. *Conflict*, pp. 27-32), Manahan lists the quotation of 20.10 in one category with the voice of the priests and prophets in 26.11 (cf. "Survey," p. 178), and Trapp joins the voices in 10.6-10 to the quotations of 2.20-35 (cf. "Other Sides," p. 232). Conversely, Biddle overlooks the virtual marking in 4.31 (קול שִׁמְעָתִי) and mistakes the quotation of Lady Zion for a voice: "A poet has given Jerusalem literary independence. . . . She is a character with a voice of her own"; *Polyphony*, p. 116. One particular feature of Jeremiah's voices is the ambiguity of the speakers. The voice in 4.19-21 is a case in point: traditionally, it used to be assigned to the "weeping prophet"; cf. William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1986), pp. 160-161; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT, 1st Reihe, 12; Tübingen: Mohr, 1947), p. 29. However, other interpreters read it as a lament of Zion; cf. F. Kumaki, "A New Look at Jer 4.19-22 and Jer 10.19-21," *AJBI* 8 (1982): 113-22; Marjo C. A. Korpel, "Who is Speaking in Jeremiah 4:19-22? The Contribution of Unit Delimitation to an Old Problem," *VT* 59 (2009): 88-98; Biddle, *Polyphony*, pp. 20-22. Still others think that YHWH is the character in dismay; J. J. M. Roberts, "The Motif of the Weeping God in Jeremiah and its Background in the Lament Tradition of the Ancient Near East," *OTE* 5 (1992): 361-74; David A. Bosworth, "The Tears of God in the Book of Jeremiah," *Bib* 94 (2013): 24-46. For Zahavi-Ely, the ambiguity is intentional; cf. "Voice," p. 173. A similar scenario appears in 10.19-20.

these technical domains has flowed from and fostered our initial account of the frame-inset relationship. In addition to the hermeneutical guidelines that were established in this chapter thus far, our understanding of quoted speech also informs our exegesis of 2.1-3.5 in other important ways. For instance, the focus on context and communicative integration requires that our examination must be of a synchronic kind.<sup>85</sup> Without denying that an ancient text of the length of Jeremiah has had a complex compositional history, the reconstruction of this process remains inevitably tentative and too often entails the reorganization of the literary parameters.<sup>86</sup> Since such operations would cause significant disruptions to the contextual dynamics of the quotations, it is preferable not to

---

85. Cf. Benjamin A. Foreman: "An investigation which focuses on the imagery, or the 'literary qualities' of a text, is primarily a synchronic enterprise: it is concerned with understanding the text before us rather than with attempting to determine how the text before us came into being"; *Animal Metaphors and the People of Israel in the Book of Jeremiah* (FRLANT 238; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), p. 30; Jacobson, *Saying*: "The function of the God quotations must be evaluated primarily based on the role that the quotations play in the final form of the psalm"; pp. 91-92. For a helpful discussion of synchronic analysis in Jeremiah, see Kessler (ed.), *Coherence*; John Hill, *Friend Or Foe? The Figure of Babylon in the Book of Jeremiah MT* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 10-13; R. Abma, *Bonds of Love: Methodic Studies of Prophetic Texts with Marriage Imagery: Isaiah 50.1-3 and 54.1-10, Hosea 1-3, Jeremiah 2-3* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1999), pp. 36-39. The relationship between synchronic and diachronic remains a difficult issue. Sternberg, for instance, distinguishes between "source-oriented" and "discourse-oriented" analysis and sees both in necessary interdependence (cf. *Poetics*, pp. 15-19). Paul R. Noble asserts contrariwise that they are marked by "fundamental incompatibility"; "Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation," *JTL* 7 (1993): 137.

86. We may point here to the substantial reorganization of John Bright's analysis (*Jeremiah* [AB 21; New York: Doubleday, 1965], pp. 9-18) or Biddle's multi-layered sketch which entails among other operations the split of 2.20 (reading 2.20aα with 2.19) and 2.25 (reading 2.25b with 2.33-34; cf. *Redaction*, p. 56). The scholarly assessment of the 2fs-material, which plays such an important role in Biddle's redaction, is far from unified. Whereas Levin thinks that it forms "den Grundstock des Blocks 2.2-4.4" (*Verheißung*, p. 157), we saw that Herrmann makes significant diachronic distinctions within this block; Wischnowsky excludes the 2fs-address in 2.16 ("eigentümlich deplaziert"; *Zion*, pp. 118-121). In striking contrast, Holladay (pp. 67-68) envisions the 2fs-material in 2.10-25, 29-37 as a later addition and E. W. Nicholson's thinks that Jer 2 "comprises five passages which were originally independent of each other"; *Jeremiah 1-25* (CBC; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), p. 28. The putative differentiation between prosaic and poetic material that at times informs these proposals introduces further problems; cf. H. Lallemand-deWinkel: "A clear distinction between prose and poetry turned out to be a rather arbitrary criterion in searching for the origins of the book"; *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), p. 47.

introduce this variable and hypothetical element into our analysis. In the vein of Hardmeier's ambitions to capture "die rhetorisch-thematische Gesamtanlage der Wortkomposition,"<sup>87</sup> we will consequently approach 2.1-3.5 as a literary composition in its own right and integrity, seeking to assess the quotations within the full scope of their contextual framework.

The theoretical foundations articulated in this chapter thus determine our handling of the question of synchrony and diachrony, yet they also bear on matters of text and transmission. As is commonly known, Jer-LXX is nearly one sixth shorter than Jer-MT (ca. 3,000 words) and the "Oracles against the Nations" appear in a different location and arrangement.<sup>88</sup> This scenario and the traditional principle of *lectio brevior* has led some early interpreters to regard the LXX *Vorlage* as the older version and Jer-MT as a later expansion. However, it was not until Janzen's discussion of the Qumran discoveries that this position has become as dominant as it is today.<sup>89</sup> Of special importance for LXX-priority is the Hebrew fragment 4Q71 (= 4QJer<sup>b</sup>; covering 9.22-10.21) which is commonly

---

87. "Redekomposition," p. 18. See further, *ibid.*, "Geschichte": "Die Literatur gewordene prophetische Überlieferung. . . ist eine Größe *sui generis* mit einem Geschichts- und Erfahrungsbezug *als Ganzer*, aus der aufgrund eine naiven Verhältnisbestimmung von Text und Realität nicht irgendein Textteil einfach herausgebrochen werden kann"; p. 9 (emphasis original). It must be noted, however, that Hardmeier himself excludes many parts as secondary, such as 2.23a and 2.26b-31a; cf. "Redekomposition," p. 22.

88. These oracles are found in Jer-MT in chs. 46-51, yet Jer-LXX includes them, similar to Isaiah and Ezekiel, in a medial book position in chs. 25-32. For statistics relating to word count, see. Y.-J. Min, "The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins" (Ph. D. diss., Hebrew University Jerusalem, 1977), p. 159. Divergence between MT and LXX versions appears also between other books, such as Joshua, Ezekiel, 1 Samuel, or Proverbs, but nowhere to the extent of Jeremiah; cf. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd rev. ed.; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001), pp. 327-350; Johan Lust, "Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* (SBLSCS 52; ed. Adrian Schenker; Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2003), pp. 83-92.

89. Cf. F. D. Hubman, "Bemerkungen zur Älteren Diskussion um die Unterschiede zwischen MT und G im Jeremiabuch," in *Deuteronomistische Bewegung*, pp. 263-270. Gerald J. Janzen's conclusion has become common place in Jeremiah studies: "The text of M has undergone much secondary expansion. . . . M is a revised text"; *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 127.

deemed to agree with the LXX *Vorlage* rather than with Jer-MT.<sup>90</sup> The case for LXX-priority has been fostered alongside this material evidence by the systematic comparison of the two editions as undertaken by Tov, Bogaert, Stipp, and others.<sup>91</sup> There are, however, several exegetes who have presented arguments that undermine this majority position. In addition to the criticism that has been mounted against Janzen's work,<sup>92</sup> the implications of the Qumran evidence have also been called into question.<sup>93</sup> Primarily Fischer, but also other scholars, have further amassed literary arguments that challenge an *a priori* assumption of LXX-priority. These relate, for instance, to the translational character of Jer-LXX, the location of the "Oracles against the Nations," the omission of divine epithets, and the comparison between Jer 52 (MT and LXX) and 2 Kgs 24-25.<sup>94</sup>

---

90. Cf. Janzen, *Studies*: "This broken text does witness dramatically to its family connections [with LXX]"; p. 181; see further especially Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of its Textual History," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; ed. Tov; Leiden: Brill 1999), pp. 363-384; *ibid.*, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in *Livre*, pp. 145-167. Tov's reconstruction of 4Q71 can be found in *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (ed. Ulrich Eugene; Leiden: Brill, 2010), p. 562. Largely in agreement with Jer-MT, the text of 43.2-10 in 4Q72a (= 4QJer<sup>d</sup>) likewise reflects Jer-LXX in some places.

91. This has been pointed out by Shimon Gesundheit, "The Question of LXX Jeremiah as a Tool for Literary-Critical Analysis," *VT* 62 (2012): 32-33 (for references, see the entries throughout pp. 30-34).

92. The central critique of Janzen's work is the generalizing tendency of his conclusions; Cf. Sven Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp. 193-248; David J. Reimer, *The Oracles Against Babylon in Jeremiah 50-51: A Horror Among the Nations* (San Francisco, CA: Edwin Mellen, 1993), pp. 108-112; Tov, "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)," *ZAW* 91 (1979): 74; M. Dahood's review of Janzen, *Studies*, in *Bib* 56 (1975): 429-431. The problem of generalization is inherent to all LXX/MT-discussions that are based on the Qumran scrolls. After all, less than 300 (ca. 23%) of the over 1,300 verses of Jer-MT are represented in the extant material, much of which is fragmentary in nature; cf. Glanz, *Shifts*: "A final and detailed judgment on the text-critical relation between the MT, the LXX and Qumran fragments is not possible"; p. 219.

93. See here especially the assessment by Fischer who emphasizes the agreement between Jer-MT and 2Q13, 4Q70, 4Q72, and 4Q72b, and the ambiguous character of the key evidence of 4Q71 and 4Q72a; *Stand der Theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2007), pp. 19-25.

94. See, e.g., Fischer, *Stand*, pp. 25-53; *Der Prophet wie Mose: Studien zum Jeremiabuch* (BZAR 15; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), pp. 1-89; Alexander Rofé, "The Arrangement of the

It goes without saying that the relationship and discussion of Jer-MT and Jer-LXX is far more complex than this brief overview can illustrate. Yet, since the quotations in 2.1-3.5 are present in both Jer-MT and Jer-LXX and since the variations between the versions are relatively sparse in this passage,<sup>95</sup> it is not necessary to delve into further detail. Bearing in mind this textual scenario and because LXX-priority is not without its challenges, there is at this point no justification to prioritize the Greek text. Seeking to recognize and respect the coexistence of Jer-MT and Jer-LXX in the ancient reading community, both versions are regarded in our study as literary products in their own right, each with its own characteristics, arrangement, and viewpoints.<sup>96</sup> Rather than an evaluative judgment regarding priority (or superiority), our focus on Jer-MT is due solely to our interest in the contextual dynamics, marking, integration, and framing of quotations in Hebrew discourse.<sup>97</sup> As with our decision for a

---

Book of Jeremiah," *ZAW* 101 (1989): 390-398; "The Name *ṢĒBĀ'ŌT* and the Shorter Recension of Jeremiah," in *Prophetie und Geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im Alten Israel* (FS Herrmann; eds. Liwak and S. Wagner; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991), pp. 307-316; Lundbom, "Haplography in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah," *HS* 46 (2005): 301-320; Seitz, "The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah," *ZAW* 101 (1989): 18-27. See further the references listed in Gesundheit, "Question" (pp. 35-36), and Shead, *The Open Book and the Sealed Book: Jeremiah 32 in its Hebrew and Greek Recensions* (JSOTSup 347; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 15-16).

95. For a thorough comparison, see Eiji Suganuma, "Jeremiah Chapter 2: A Form-critical and Theological Study" (Ph. D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1971), pp. 29-49.

96. Cf. Shead, *Open Book*: "For better or for worse, M is a finished product, as is LXXV, and as such deserves consideration as a finished whole," p. 263; so, e.g., also Louis Stulman, *Jeremiah* (AOTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2005), p. 8. This position is affirmed by LXX-researchers; cf. N. F. Marcos: "The Greek Bible contains genuine, textual and literary variants from the Hebrew to the extent that we have to respect both traditions, without trying to reduce or adjust one to the other. As a result, in some books of the Old Testament, the Hebrew and the Greek transmit differing editions which, in the present state of our knowledge, cannot be reduced to a common original"; *The Septuagint in Context: An Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (translated by Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2010), p. 77. The distinct nature of the two versions is highlighted, e.g., by Sweeney, "Differing Perspectives in the LXX and MT Versions of Jeremiah 1-10," in *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception of Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature* (FAT 89; ed. ibid.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), pp. 135-153; Godefroid B. Kilunga, *Prééminence de YHWH ou Autonomie du Prophète: Etude Comparative et Critique des Confessions de Jérémie dans le Texte Hébreu Massorétique et la "Septante"* (OBO 254; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

97. The text that is used in our analysis is Codex Leningradensis as found in *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensis* (5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997) with the text-critical apparatus by Rudolph from 1970 (hereafter *BHS*). The text for Jer-LXX is gleaned from

synchronic approach, so our textual orientation is likewise determined by the object of our investigation.

The textual and analytical parameters of our exegesis have now been established and the remainder of this study is devoted to the detailed examination of the speech quotations in 2.1-3.5. Our next chapter will prepare this analysis by means of a translation and text discussion which defines the relevant frame for each inset in the composition. The subsequent five chapters build on these foundations and analyze all twelve quotations within their distinct units. Focused throughout on the relationship between frame and inset, these analyses will apply the observations that we have made throughout this chapter. Thus they serve to test the accuracy of our arguments and demonstrate the merit of reading prophetic speech quotations in context.

---

the critical edition of Joseph Ziegler (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis Editum Volume XV: Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957). References to Targum are based on the Aramaic printed text in Menachem Cohen (ed.), *Miqra'ot Gedolot "Haketer" Jeremiah* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2012) and Robert Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible 12; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987). The text that is cited for the Latin Vulgate comes from Weber-Gryson, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata Editio Quinta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).



## Chapter Three - In Search of a Framework: The Text and Structure of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5

### 1. Introduction

Sequentially after the historical preface (1.1-3) and the call of the prophet (1.4-19), 2.1-3.5 presents YHWH's first speech to Judah and Jerusalem in the book. Due to this prominent position, the passage has attracted a considerable amount of scholarly attention, covering the whole spectrum from traditional inquiries related to providence and production to the multiplicity of "new approaches" that have characterized Jeremiah studies in recent decades.<sup>1</sup> While this development naturally reflects the ever-changing trends of scholarship, it is just as much grounded in the many-contoured configuration of the passage itself. Over the course of YHWH's speech in 2.1-3.5, the vantage point shifts from past to present to future, genres of accusation and lament are entwined with religious polemics, rhetorical questions interlock with imperatives, and the imagery shifts abruptly from bride to desert to animal to thief. Faced with such a complex literary landscape, any claim to have detected *the* central topic, arrangement, or purpose of this text must be regarded with caution.<sup>2</sup> The only

---

1. The discussion of the providence and profile of Jeremiah's first chapters frequently revolved around the prophet's early ministry; see, e.g., Bernard Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHAT; Tübingen: Mohr, 1901), pp. xiii, 15; H. W. Hertzberg "Jeremia und das Nordreich Israel," *ThLZ* 77 (1952): 595-601; Rainer Albertz, "Jer 2-6 und die Frühzeitverkündigung Jeremias," *ZAW* 94 (1982): 25-34. The most thorough study of historical backgrounds is found in Liwak, *Geschichte*, pp. 104-211. The use of text traditions, such as Deut 32, Hosea, or the Asaph Psalms, has been treated by Suganuma ("Jeremiah," pp. 201-256) and an overview of redactional research is available in Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 44-46. For approaches from reader-response, gender, or post-colonial perspectives, see Diamond, Stulman, and O'Connor, *Troubling*. For other studies on Jer 2-3, see the bibliographies of Holladay, pp. 47-49; Herrmann, *Jeremia* (BKAT 12/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), pp. 93-95; Fischer, *Jeremia 1-25* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2005), p. 146.

2. Such proposals are prone to "over-read" or "under-read" the passage. An example of the first category is Job Y. Yindo's sketch of Jer 2 as a cyclic movement structured around interlocking marital and horticultural metaphors; *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1-24* (HSM 64; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), pp. 179-182. The pitfalls of "under-reading" this complex and multifaceted text come to the surface,



way to grasp the contours of YHWH's speech is not via the path of categories, root metaphors, and thematic patterns, but along the course which it sets before us, unit by unit, clause by clause, word by word.<sup>3</sup>

The twelve quoted insets of 2.1-3.5 which concern us in this study are spread out evenly across the passage (cf. 2.6, 8, 20, 23, 25, 27[×3], 31, 35[×2]; 3.4-5). In view of our discussion in the previous chapter, our first exegetical task must be to outline the extent of the frame of each of these quotations. This task will be executed in three stages. First, since there is considerable disagreement about the boundaries of Jeremiah's opening chapters, we need to discuss the demarcation of 2.1-3.5. Second, we will present a thorough translation of this passage which facilitates a first encounter with the discourse and its quotations. As the third step, we will determine the boundaries, structure, and communication design of the individual units that comprise the passage. This text analysis affords a nuanced introduction to 2.1-3.5 and lays the foundations for the subsequent chapters. More importantly, however, it offers a first

---

for instance, in Else K. Holt's unfounded claim that "the water metaphor governs and unites the discourse of ch. 2"; "The Helpless Potentate: A Neglected Image in Jeremiah," in *The Centre and the Periphery: A European Tribute to Walter Brueggemann* (HBM 27; eds. Jill Middlemas, David J. A. Clines, and Holt; Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2010), p. 181. Equally problematic are studies that assign this role to the marriage imagery in this text. See, e.g., Diamond and O'Connor, "Passions": "We claim that the marital metaphor functions as a root metaphor, organizing the disparate pieces of the composition"; p. 124. Similar sentiments are expressed in Yates, "Message"; Shields, *Circumscribing*, pp. 10-11; Seock-Tae Sohn, *YHWH, The Husband of Israel: The Metaphor of Marriage between YHWH and Israel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2002), pp. 84-96; Douglas S. Abel, "The Marriage Metaphor in Hosea 4 and Jeremiah 2: How Prophetic Speech 'Kills Two Birds with One Stone,'" *Proceedings* 29 (2009): 15-27. Alongside the more cautious evaluation by Abma (cf. *Marriage*, p. 215) and the outright dismissal by Wischnowsky (cf. *Zion*, p. 114), especially the assessment by Sharon Moughtin-Mumby has undermined the significance of the marriage metaphor in Jer 2-3; cf. *Sexual and Marital Metaphors in Hosea, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and Ezekiel* (OTM; Oxford: OUP, 2008), pp. 80-116. Alternatively, Abma (*Marriage*, p. 239) and Enrique S. Giménez-Rico (cf. "Encontrar a Yahveh sin Salir a Buscarlo," *Est Ecl* 82 [2007]: 461-490) have drawn attention to the numerous references to movement in 2.1-3.5. It must be noted, however, that הלך does not occur in 2.10-13, 20-22, 26-32, and 33-37, and that דרך is virtually confined to 2.17-18 and 2.33-34.

3. Walter Brueggemann: "There will be a temptation in interpretation to summarize and reduce, and one must have the patience to stay with the poetic nuance and detail in order to hear fully the word given through the poem"; *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile and Homecoming* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 32.

impression of the basic characteristics of the quotations, such as their locations and interrelationships, and the varied and complex surroundings in which they are framed.

## 2. Demarcation

Enclosed by the call narrative in chapter 1 and the first prose section in chapter 7, Jer 2-6 forms the first substantial discourse block in the book and is commonly divided into 2.1-4.4 and 4.5-6.30. There is no dispute about the beginning of 2.1-4.4, but interpreters are divided over whether the first half of this section ends at 2.37 or at 3.5. Support for the first option is at times derived from lexical links that suggest the unity of 3.1-4.4;<sup>4</sup> however, the primary reason to draw a line after 2.37 is the occurrence of **לְאָמַר** in 3.1.

While many exegetes suspect that a corrupted introduction formula lies behind this rare headless infinitive,<sup>5</sup> neither Targum, which echoes the MT (**לְמִימַר**), nor Jer-LXX, in which **לְאָמַר** is missing, corroborate this hypothesis. Alternatively, the omission in Jer-LXX has led some interpreters to delete the troublesome infinitive.<sup>6</sup> But although this use of **לְאָמַר** without another verb is unique in Jeremiah, it remains an intelligible part of the verse and occurs five times elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, since the book is notorious for a wide and varied

---

4. E.g., שׁוּב in 3.1, 6-7, 10, 12, 14, 19, 22; 4.1; חָנַף in 3.1-2, 9. For other links between 3.1-5 and 3.6ff, see Lundbom, p. 306.

5. See, e.g. Allen, p. 53; Bright, p. 19; Carroll, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986), p. 141; Craigie, p. 50; Rudolph, p. 20; Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 86; Böhler, "Geschlechterdifferenz," p. 99.

6. E.g., McKane, p. 58; Meier, *Speaking*, pp. 96-97; Albert Condamin, *Le Livre de Jérémie* (Paris: Gabala, 1936), p. 22; D. Paul Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (KAT 10; Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1928), p. 35; NIV, NRSV.

7. For **לְאָמַר** in Jeremiah, see "Context and Identification" above. For the other instances of headless **לְאָמַר**, see Miller, *Representation*, p. 196. Shields has deduced from Hag 2.11 that **לְאָמַר** marks a legal citation in 3.1; cf. *Circumscribing*, pp. 4-5 (so already Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [repr.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989], p. 307). Yet, since **לְאָמַר** in Hag 2 is accompanied by a *verbum dicendi* (**שָׁאֵל**) and occurs not in an address by YHWH but in a

range of introduction formulas,<sup>8</sup> a correction of this anomaly seems just as inappropriate as an excision. The best option is to follow the paraphrase of Vulgate (vulgo dicitur: “it is commonly said”) which retains the verb without interpolating an introduction formula.<sup>9</sup>

These initial observations suggest that the question of demarcation cannot be brought to bear upon the perplexing *לֵאמֹר* but must rest instead on the literary relationship of Jer 2 and Jer 3. A comparison between 2.1-3.5 and 3.6ff reveals that these two sections are divided by the strongest break in chapters 2-6. Not only does the formula *וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי* indicate the beginning of a new section (cf. 1.7; 3.11; 13.6; 15.1), but 3.6-10 also switches from YHWH’s address back to the divine-prophetic dialogue format of Jer 1 and supplies a historical reference point (*בְּיָמַי יֵאָשְׁרֵהוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ*), the kind of which was absent in 2.1-3.5. Since YHWH no longer talks to city and people, but privately to his prophet (*הִרְאֵיתִי*, v. 6), and since discursive and temporal features indicate a new setting of his speech, 3.6ff exhibits a marked discontinuity with what precedes it.<sup>10</sup>

Correspondingly, 2.1-3.5 is distinguished by strong marks of internal coherence. Most importantly, chapter 2 and the first five verses of chapter 3 are united by the 2fs-address which appears in 2.2-3, 14-25, and runs without interruption from 2.33 to 3.5.<sup>11</sup> With this pervasive, feminine address compared

---

dialogue between prophet and priests, the two passages are hardly comparable.

8. Fischer has shown that Jeremiah’s palette of introductory formulae reflects a “grundsätzliche Flexibilität bezüglich Formen und Verwendungen. . . Die eröffnenden Wendungen alleine reichen für eine Gliederung nicht aus”; pp. 78-80.

9. So, e.g., Herrmann, “Jeremia 3: Der Inhalt und seine Form,” in *Ich bewirke das Heil und erschaffe das Unheil (Jesaja 45.7): Studien zur Botschaft der Propheten* (FS Lothar Ruppert; FzB 88; eds. F. Diedrich and B. Wilmes; Würzburg: Echter, 1998), p. 211. Fischer (“So”; p. 185) and Holladay (“As follows”; p. 112) present feasible alternatives.

10. On the distinct character of 3.6-11, see, e.g., Sweeney, “Redaction,” p. 209.

11. Cf. Finsterbusch, “Kommunikationsebenen”: “Diese Kurzform [i.e., *לֵאמֹר*] repräsentiert eine ausführliche Redeeinleitung. . . die aber aus Sicht der Verfasser und Redaktoren nicht nochmals ausführlich zitiert werden musste. Denn die Leserschaft wird naturgemäß diejenige Redeeinleitung mitdenken, in der im Lesegefälle des Textes *לֵאמֹר* zuletzt

to only two such instances after 3.5 (vv. 13, 19), the unit of 3.1-5 stands much closer to 2.1-37 than to 3.6ff. This linkage is substantiated structurally by the large scale “youth-inclusio” between 2.2 (נְעִירִיךָ) and 3.4 (נְעָרִי), the double-imperatives which appear in 2.19 (וְדַעֲי וְרֹאֵ), in 2.23 (רֹאֵי/דַעֲי), and in 3.2 (שְׁעִי/וְרֹאֵי), and the repeated interrogative particles in the 2fs-material (cf. 2.14, 17, 21, 23, 33, 36; 3.1, 4).<sup>12</sup> The speech quotations in the feminine address further highlight the cohesion of 2.1-3.5 (cf. 2.20, 23, 25, 35; 3.4-5). Although some interpreters prefer to designate 3.1-5 as a transition passage,<sup>13</sup> these extensive thematic, literary, and communicative links and the explicit break between 3.5 and 3.6 strongly suggest that YHWH’s first speech to Judah and Jerusalem is to be demarcated as 2.1-3.5.

### 3. Translation

2.1 And the word of YHWH came to me, saying:<sup>14</sup>

2.2 Go and call out in the ears<sup>15</sup> of Jerusalem, saying:

---

verwendet wurde, d. h., MT-Jer 2,1.2aa1”; p. 255 (emphasis original). So also Abma, *Marriage*, p. 229; Hardmeier, “Redekomposition,” p. 29. Already Kimchi draws a connection between לֵאמֹר and 2.37; cf. *Miqra’ot*, p. 18.

12. For other formal and thematic links, see Shields, *Circumscribing*, pp. 7-16.

13. So, e.g., Fischer, p. 183; Fretheim, p. 59; Yindo, *Metaphor*, pp. 69-70.

14. Jer-LXX only reads Καὶ εἶπε for 2.1-2aa (cf. *BHS*). This shorter reading may be explained as an expansion in Jer-MT (so, e.g., Duhm, p. 16; Janzen, *Studies*, p. 113; Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 161). However, it may just as likely be the remainder of a longer superscription (cf. D. Carl Heinrich Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia* [Leipzig: Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz, 1905], p. 15) or the result of deliberate shortening (cf. Rudolph, p. 10; Holladay, p. 81; Willy Schottroff, “Jeremia 2.1-3: Erwägungen zur Methode der Prophetenexegese,” *ZThK* 67 [1970]: 264-265; Heinz-Dieter Neef, “Gottes Treue und Israel’s Untreue: Aufbau und Einheit von Jeremia 2.2-13,” *ZAW* 99 [1987]: 39-40). The latter option could have been motivated by the unconventional expression בְּאָזְנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם (so Fischer, *Stand*, p. 46). While the divergence cannot be resolved, Jer-MT evidently highlights Jerusalem’s role in the ensuing discourse (cf. Finsterbusch, “Kommunikationsebenen,” p. 262).

15. Hardmeier (“Redekomposition,” p. 19) is correct that קרא + ב + אֵזֶן is used elsewhere in Jeremiah for the public reading of written documents (cf. Biddle, *Redaction*: “Read aloud to Jerusalem!” p. 160). However, 2.2 makes no reference to such objects (cf. סֵפֶר in 29.9; 36.10, 13, 21; מִגִּלָּה in 36.6, 14-15; see also סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית in Exod 24.7, 2 Kgs 23.2, 2 Chr 34.30; הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת in Deut 31.11; סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה in Neh 8.3; סֵפֶר מֹשֶׁה in Neh 13.1). The construction קרא + ב + אֵזֶן occurs

Thus says YHWH:

I am mindful for your sake<sup>16</sup> of the faithfulness of your youth,  
the love of your bridal days,<sup>17</sup>  
your following after me through the wilderness,  
through a land not sown.

- 2.3 Holy was Israel before YHWH,  
the first-fruit of his produce.<sup>18</sup>

All who devoured him became guilty,  
disaster came upon them. —Speech of YHWH—

- 2.4 Hear the word of YHWH, O House of Jacob,  
and all the clans of the House of Israel:

- 2.5 Thus says YHWH:

What injustice<sup>19</sup> did your fathers find in me  
that they went far from me?<sup>20</sup>

They went after deceptive idols and were deceived<sup>21</sup>

- 2.6 and they did not say:  
“Where is YHWH,

---

without object also in Jdg 7.3 and Ezek 8.18, 9.1.

16. Only few translations take תָּלַח (missing in Jer-LXX) into account (e.g., ELB; JPS). For ל + זכר as “ל of advantage” (*dativus commodi*), see WHS §271a; cf. Lev 26.45; Neh 5.19; 13.14-31; Ps 25.17; 106.45. Cf. Schottroff, “Gedenken” im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament: *Die Wurzel Zākar im Semitischen Sprachkreis* (WMANT 15; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), pp. 230-233.

17. With reference to Greek τελειώσεως, Ugaritic *kl*, and post-biblical הכליל, which all describe a state of completion, McKane (pp. 27-28) has demonstrated that the *hapax legomena* כָּלוּלוֹת does not indicate engagement but the first days of marriage (pace WOC §7.4.2b; BDB, p. 483).

18. According to JM §94h (quoted by Abma, *Marriage*, p. 223), the final-ה with 3ms-suffix (תְּבוּאָתָהּ; cf. Jer-LXX: αὐτοῦ) is “fairly common and is normal in early Hebrew inscriptions”; so also GKC §7c, 91e; see, e.g., Gen 49.11. The correction suggested by Q (תְּבוּאָתוֹ) must not be implemented. For כָּל־אֲכָלָיו, see the discussion of 2.1-3 below.

19. This rendering of עָוָל is based on Neef, “Aufbau” (p. 39), *HALOT* (2:797-798), and our discussion below.

20. Interpreters are divided over whether the question mark should be placed after v. 5aα (e.g., Holladay, p. 49), after the *atnah* (e.g., Cornill, p. 16; Craigie, p. 26; Lundbom, p. 256), or after v. 5b (e.g., Carroll, p. 121; Fischer, p. 147; McKane, p. 30). In light of the switch from YHWH’s self-references (בִּי/מֵעָלַי) to references to idols and the change from qatal to wayyiqtol (וַיְהִיבְלוּ), the second option is preferred here. For nominalizing כִּי (“that”), see WHS §451a.

21. הבל appears in Jeremiah as a synonym for idols and other gods; cf. 8.19; 10.8, 15 (= 51.18); so, e.g., Duhm, p. 18; Rudolph, p. 11; Barstad, “HBL als Bezeichnung der fremden Götter im Alten Testament und der Gott Hubal,” *ST* 32 (1978): 57-65. For the notion of deception, see the discussion below.

- who brought us up from the land of Egypt,<sup>22</sup>  
 who led us through the wilderness,  
 through a land of steppe and pit,  
 through a land of dryness and deep darkness,  
 through a land which nobody crosses  
 and where nobody lives?”
- 2.7 I brought you to a fruitful land<sup>23</sup>  
 to feast on its fruit and its goodness.  
 But you came in and you defiled my land!  
 My possession you turned into an abomination!
- 2.8 The priests did not say: “Where is YHWH?”  
 those who handle Torah did not know me,  
 the shepherds transgressed against me,  
 the prophets prophesied by Baal,  
 and they went after idols which will not benefit.<sup>24</sup>
- 2.9 Therefore, I still<sup>25</sup> contend with you —Speech of YHWH—  
 and with the children of your children I will contend!
- 2.10 For cross over to the coastlands of Kittim and see!  
 Send to Kedar and examine with care!  
 See whether such a thing has happened:
- 2.11 Has any nation ever changed gods?  
 And those are not even gods!  
 But my people have exchanged their glory<sup>26</sup>

---

22. The *atnah* after מַצְרַיִם may signal the end of the question, yet the article before מוֹלִיד signifies a relative clause rather than a pronominal construction (i.e., “He led us”); cf. WOC §37.5b; *WHS* §90.

23. While כְּרַמֶּל is a specific location in Jeremiah and other texts (cf. 46.18; 48.33; 50.19; Amos 1.2, 9.3; Nah 1.4), אֶרֶץ and וְנַחֲלָתִי suggest in this passage the generic “Promised Land” (cf. 4.26; Deut 8.7-10).

24. Like 2.11 (לֹא + יַעַל), 2.8bβ is an asyndetic relative clause; cf. WOC §9.6d; 19.6b. Most of twenty-three appearances of יַעַל occur in polemics against idols; cf. Vulgate in 2.8: “et idola secuti sunt”; see, e.g., Isa 44.9-10; 57.12; 16.19; Hab 2.18.

25. Since Israel’s waywardness stretches from Egypt to the Promised Land (vv. 4-8), עוֹד expresses continuity rather than addition (“once more”), repetition (“again”), or degree (“even more”); so, e.g., also Liwak, *Geschichte*, p. 156.

26. The same instance of Tiq soph כְּבוֹדוֹ (a euphemism for כְּבוֹדִי) appears in Hos 4.7 and Ps 106.20. Yet, according to C. McCarthy, “none of these three verses contains a genuine scribal emendation”; *The Tiqune Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the*

- for that which will not benefit.
- 2.12 Be appalled at this, O heavens,  
be shocked and utterly desolate!<sup>27</sup> —Speech of YHWH—
- 2.13 For my people have committed two evils:  
me they have forsaken, the fountain of living waters,  
thus digging<sup>28</sup> wells for themselves,  
wells which are about to break,  
which will not hold their water.<sup>29</sup>
- 2.14 Was Israel a bondsman?  
Or was he even a home-born slave?<sup>30</sup>  
Why has he become spoil?
- 2.15 The young lions have roared against him,  
they have lifted their voice.<sup>31</sup>  
They have turned his land into a waste,  
his cities were burnt,<sup>32</sup> left without inhabitants.
- 2.16 Likewise, the sons of Noph and Tahpanhes<sup>33</sup>

---

*Old Testament* (OBO 36; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), p. 105.

27. The pointing of the imptv. חָרְבוּ is irregular (cf. regular חָרְבוּ in 50.27; Jer-LXX [ἐπὶ πλεῖον] and Vulgate [desolamini vehementer] relate to הרבה). While McKane (p. 34) points out that a correction would yield the only instance of “‘desolation’ in an emotive sense,” this is contextually acceptable. Neatly parallel to שָׁעַר, Rudolph’s suggestion חָרְדוּ (“zittert”; p. 12; cf. *BHS*) never occurs with שָׁמַיִם.

28. For לָחַצְב as a result clause, see WOC §36.2.3d, *WHS* §198, and the discussion below.

29. Following Abma (cf. *Marriage*, p. 223), the translation of נִשְׁבְּרִים is based on the distinction between Qal pass. part. (completed action) and Ni. part. (action in process); cf. JM §121q. The article (הַ) can sometimes be used in place of a possessive pronoun; cf. *WHS* §86.

30. The translation in past tense is based on the verb היה and the qal forms throughout 2.11-15. For the expressions and rhetorical structure of 2.14, see our discussion below.

31. Rudolph (p. 14; cf. *BHS*) proposes to harmonize the different verbal forms (יִשְׁאַגּוּ and נִתְּנוּ) to homogeneous qal (so already Duhm, p. 22) or to regard the singular yiqtol יִשְׁאַגּוּ as an iterative form (cf. *WHS* §168). With Holladay (p. 94), however, the verbs can be understood as a common perf./imperf. parallelism (cf. 5.6). The imperf. verb has an “Aufmerksamkeitswert” (Liwak, *Geschichte*, p. 165) and “der ganze Vers bezieht sich auf die Vergangenheit” (Herrmann, p. 99).

32. Whereas K (נִצְתָה) can be derived from נָצַח (destroy) or יָצַח (burn), Q (נִצְתוּ) can only come from יָצַח (cf. McKane, p. 36). Both K and Q are represented in Hebrew manuscripts (cf. *BHS*) and denote the same outcome for Israel’s cities. The Q reading is preferred because it matches the plural of עָרָיו; so, e.g., Holladay, pp. 50-51.

33. Three different spellings are attested for the Egyptian city Tahpanhes; cf. Manfred Goerg, “‘Tachpanhes’: Eine Prominente Judäische Adresse in Ägypten,” *BN* 97 (1999): 24. For Q, see 43.7, 8, 9; 44.1; 46.14. The reading of K (תַּחְפָּנֶס), cf. *BHS*) could be either a mistake or a variant spelling (cf. Ezek 30.18).

will smash your skull!<sup>34</sup>

- 2.17 Is it not this that will do this to you,  
that you forsake<sup>35</sup> YHWH, your God,  
at a time when he leads you in the way?
- 2.18 Therefore,<sup>36</sup> for what reason do you seek<sup>37</sup> the way of Egypt  
to drink the waters of the Nile?  
And for what reason do you seek the way of Assyria  
to drink the waters of the Euphrates?
- 2.19 Your evil will discipline you  
and your apostasies will reprove you!  
Then you will know and see<sup>38</sup> how evil and bitter it is  
that you forsake YHWH, your God,  
and that you do not fear me.<sup>39</sup>

---

34. Several readings have been proposed for ירעוך (from רעה, “to pasture”; cf. SCL, ZB, ELB: “abweiden”). While Jer-LXX (ἐγχεῖν σε) and some Hebrew manuscripts read ירעוך, this is likely a confused spelling between ר and ד. Following Cornill (p. 22), Rudolph (p. 14) suggests ירעוך (“kahlscheren,” from ערה, Pi.; cf. Isa 3.17 + קדקד). With reference to the Peshitta (= ירעוך), Bright (p. 9) and Lundbom (p. 269) read “to crack” (from רעע II; cf. BDB, p. 949; so also NIV, KJV, NRSV). Holladay (p. 51) opts instead for ירעוך (“to harm,” from רעע I, Hi.; cf. Jer 2.33; 3.5), yet translates as Bright and Lundbom. Jer-MT may be acceptable as a poetic expression (so, e.g., F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894], p. 9; Abma, *Marriage*, p. 216; Dominique Barthélemy [ed.], *Critique Textuelle de l'ancien Testament: Volume 2 - Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* [OBO 50.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], pp. 466-467). Yet, since 2.14-19 refer not to humiliation or shame (cf. 2.26, 36-37) but to destruction, the breaking of the skull (רעע II) is the better choice and requires only revoicalization. For the translation in future tense, see Lundbom (p. 272), Nicholson (p. 34), Wanke (p. 38), Craigie (p. 30), and our analysis below.

35. עֲזָבָךְ functions epexegetically despite the absent לִּי-prefix (cf. *WHS* §195; Targum adds על). Since both the cataphoric זאת and its referent עֲזָבָךְ are the subjects in 2.17 (cf. JPS; NAB), תַּעֲשֶׂה (Qal, yiqtol, 2fs) does not need be changed to a masculine form; pace Duham who reads יַעֲשֶׂה (p. 23) and Giesebrecht (p. 9) and Rudolph (p. 14) who suspect dittography and emend to עֲשֶׂה (cf. Jer-LXX: ἐποίησέ σοι). Infinitives can function as either masculine or feminine (cf. 1 Sam 18.23; WOC §6.4.2e).

36. וְעַתָּה indicates the logical conclusion of 2.14-17 (e.g., MNK §44.6).

37. The construction מִן-לִּי is used elsewhere to denote the intention or aspiration of someone's action (e.g., Jos 22.24; Jdg 1.14; 11.12; 18.23; 1 Kgs 19.9; Isa 22.1). Cf. Fischer: “Freier ließe sich ‘was ist dir’ mit ‘was suchst du’ wiedergeben”; p. 150.

38. In light of the yiqtol verbs in 2.19aa, it is preferable to read דַּעֲי and רֵאִי as *heterosis*, viz., as “a promise or prediction to be fulfilled in the future”; cf. *WHS* §34.4c.

39. וְלֹא פָחַדְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ reads literally “and the fear of me is not to you.” Since the noun פחדה is unique and the construction difficult, several interpreters correct to פָּחַדְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ and read a verb with an archaic 2fs-spelling (e.g., McKane, p. 35; Holladay, p. 52; Rudolph, p. 14; for the verbal spelling, see 2.33 and 3.4-5; for פָּחַד + אֵל, see Hos 3.5; Mic 7.17). Yet, פָּחַדְתִּי makes sense as it



—Speech of Lord YHWH Zebaoth—

2.20 For in time past, I broke your yoke,

I burst your bonds.<sup>40</sup>

But you said: “I will not serve.”<sup>41</sup>

But<sup>42</sup> on every high hill

and under every green tree,

you are bent over whoring!

2.21 I had planted you as a choice vine

entirely of wholesome seed.

How<sup>43</sup> you have turned yourself before me,

and become warped as the tendrils of a wild vine!<sup>44</sup>

2.22 Even if you wash yourself with natron

and scrub yourself with salt,

the stain of your iniquity remains before me.

—Speech of Lord YHWH—

2.23 How can you say: “I am not unclean!

After the Baalim I have not gone!”

---

stands as an objective genitive (so, e.g., Duhm, p. 24; Cornill, p. 23; Fischer, p. 166).

40. Supported by Jer-LXX (συνέτριψας/διέσπασας) and the parallel in 5.5 (שָׁבְרוּ עַל נַחֲקִי) (מוֹסְרוֹת), the verbs שָׁבַרְתִּי and נִתְקַתִּי are often understood as archaic 2fs-forms (cf. 2.33; 3.4-5; GKC §26g). This reading would indicate not a release by YHWH, but a break-away from serving YHWH (so, e.g., Giesebrecht, p. 10; Carroll, p. 130; McKane, pp. 40-41; Rudolph, p. 14; Schmidt, p. 84; Allen, p. 46; Wischnowsky, *Zion*, 116; NIV, NRSV, NET). There are, however, two crucial reasons to read them as 1cs-verbs: 1) in contrast to 2.20, both 2.33 and 3.4-5 indicate the 2fs-forms as a Q reading. In this threefold sequence, it would take a very inapt scribe to accidentally omit the *first* instance. Conversely, this anomaly lends itself easily to a harmonizing correction by Jer-LXX; 2) with the singular exception of 5.5, the yoke image is used in Jeremiah and elsewhere never for acts of self-liberation or refusal of service, but for YHWH’s acts of deliverance (see, e.g., 28.2-11; 30.8; Lev 26.13; Isa 10.27; 14.25; Ezek 34.27; Hos 11.4). See further the arguments compiled by Barbara A. Bozak, “Heeding the Received Text: Jer 2.20a, A Case in Point,” *Bib* 77 (1996): 524-537; Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 50-51; Craigie, pp. 36-37; GKC 44h. The 1cs-reading is adopted also without much ado by Kimchi (cf. *Miqra’ot*, pp. 12-13) and John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Prophet Jeremiah and Lamentations: Volume I* (translated by John Owen; Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1850), pp. 110-111.

41. Since עָל and עָבַד are correlated also in 27.8-12 and 30.8, K (אָעֲבַד) is to be preferred over Q (אָעֲבֹר) which Holladay regards as an attempt towards moderation (pp. 52-53).

42. Bozak’s assertion that כִּי “is clearly a causal conjunction meaning ‘for,’” does not square with her argument for the antithetical poetry of 2.20; “Heeding,” p. 526. With Rudolph (p. 14), the adversative “but” is preferred here (see discussion below).

43. אֵיךְ can be used for “true questions of circumstance and in exclamatory questions” (WOC §18.4d). In the context of 2.20-25, the latter (also in 3.19; 8.8; 9.18) is appropriate in 2.21b as well as in 2.23a.

44. This “speculative translation” of 2.21bβ is adopted from Craigie (p. 35).

- Look at your way in the valley!  
 Consider what you have done:  
 A swift camel, chasing to and fro on her ways,  
 2.24 a wild ass,<sup>45</sup> accustomed to the wilderness.  
 In her heat, she sniffs the wind,  
 in her desire, who can bring her back?  
 All who search for her will not be wearied.  
 In her season, they will find her.  
 2.25 Keep your foot from going bare  
 and your throat<sup>46</sup> from thirst!  
 But you said: “Forget it! No!”<sup>47</sup>  
 For I love strangers and after them I will go.”  
 2.26 Like the shame of a thief when he is found  
 thus the House of Israel was put to shame.<sup>48</sup>  
 They, their kings, their nobles,  
 and their priests and their prophets  
 2.27 were saying<sup>49</sup> to a tree: “My father you are!”

---

45. The incongruence between masculine לְמַד פָּרָה and the feminine verbs and suffixes in 2.24 has evoked a host of emendations which are review in Kenneth E. Bailey and Holladay, “The ‘Young Camel’ and ‘Wild Ass’ in Jer. II 23-25,” *VT* 18 (1968): p. 257; Foreman, *Animal*, pp. 146-148. As these two studies have demonstrated, the best solution is to retain the Hebrew text (reading here with Q נִפְשָׁה) and to regard פָּרָה as epicene, that is, to have both male and female gender.

46. K (וְגִירֹנֶךָ) reads “your threshing floor.” As a parallel to רֶגֶל and with support from Jer-LXX (φάργγυρά), Q is preferred here (וְגִירֹנֶךָ = “your throat”).

47. We will argue below that the context does not allow for translating לֹא נֹאֵשׁ with the resigned phrase “it is hopeless” (so, e.g., Lundbom, p. 284; Carroll, p. 25). The single לֹא can be categorized either as an absolute (GKC §152c), an ellipsis (*WHS* §398), or an interjection (*DCH* 4:492).

48. Following Jer-LXX (αἰσχρὴ θήσωνται), most commentators and translations render the Hophal qatal הִבִּישׁוּ as a future form. Duhm (p. 28) goes as far as to delete the verb “weil ein Futurum nötig wäre.” However, as we will show below, 2.26-27 is entirely feasible as an account of past events. YHWH’s accounts about Israel have been set in past tense before (cf. vv. 3, 14) and the next declined verb is a perf. form (פָּנִי, v. 27aβ). This reading is supported in older commentaries (cf. Calvin, p. 125; Benjamin Blayney, *Jeremiah and Lamentations* [2nd ed; Edinburgh: Oliphant & Balfour, 1810], p. 26; see also *YLT* from 1862).

49. אָמְרִים is often translated as a relative part., yet this would usually require an article (cf. *WOC* §37.5b). As a predicate part.—as it is understood here—it can refer to events and to repeated or continuous actions (cf. *WOC* §37.6d; *MNK* §20.3) and its “temporal value can only be deduced from the context” (*JM* §121f). Set between the past verbs הִבִּישׁוּ (v. 26) and פָּנִי (v. 27aβ), אָמְרִים is best captured in a past, frequentative sense; cf. Holladay: “Steady habit”; p. 103; Allen:

and to a stone: “You gave me birth!”<sup>50</sup>

For they turned to me the nape of the neck instead of the face  
but in the time of their trouble they would say:

“Rise and save us!”

2.28 So where are your gods that you made for yourself?<sup>51</sup>

Let them rise up, let them save you in the time of your trouble!

Surely, as numerous as your cities,

so are your gods, O Judah.

2.29 Why do you contend with me?

All of you have transgressed against me. —Speech of YHWH—

2.30 In vain I struck your children,

correction they did not take.

Your sword has devoured your prophets

like a destroying lion.<sup>52</sup>

2.31 O generation,<sup>53</sup> you, consider the word of YHWH:<sup>54</sup>

---

“they have been saying”; p. 45; Böhler, “Geschlechterdifferenz”: “Sie sagten”; p. 98.

50. The question of whether ילדתי (sg., so K, Jer-LXX [Σὺ ἐγέννησάς με] and Vulgate [tu me genuisti]) or ילדתני (pl., so Q; cf. Targum: בְּרִיתִיָּהּ) represent the original consonantal text cannot be resolved; for a full discussion, see Annette Böckler, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Gottesbildes* (2nd ed; Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 2002), p. 302. While Q corresponds to the plural forms הָיָה (v. 26b) and אֲמָרִים (v. 27a), this cannot count as support in its favour (cf. the parallel and uncorrected singular אָבִי). Moreover, Rudolph (p. 16) remarks that the masculine form indicated by Q (יִלְדִּיתִי) makes a poor fit for אָתָּה. He therefore repoints K to יִלְדִּיתִי and this reading as a feminine singular form is represented here; cf. Carl Friedrich Keil, *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jeremia und die Klagelieder* (Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1872), p. 50; Cornill (p. 26); Holladay (p. 54). On the articles of וְלִאֲבֹנִי and לָעֵץ, see discussion below.

51. This rendering of the initial waw (וְ) seeks to capture both the resumptive (e.g., Allen: “Where are your gods then?”; p. 45) and sarcastic tone of YHWH’s question (e.g., Duhm, p. 29, and Rudolph: “Ja wo sind denn deine Götter?”; p. 16); cf. *WHS* §439-440.

52. The textual condition of this verse has been regarded as excessively corrupt. So, e.g., Holladay (p. 106), Volz (p. 27), Rudolph (p. 16), Cornill (p. 27); Ilse von Loewenclau, “Zu Jeremia II 30,” *VT* 16 (1966): 117-23; Yair Hoffmann, “Jeremiah 2.30,” *ZAW* 89 (1977): 418-420; for a refutation of Loewenclau and Hoffmann, see Herrmann, pp. 154-155. Emendations often point to Jer-LXX which records an address form (ἐδέξασθε) in place of the referential form לְקָחוּ, lacks the pronominal suffix of חַרְבְּכֶם, and adds καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθητε at the end of the line. Yet, as Craigie has pointed out, “there are no sound reasons for doubting the integrity of the text”; p. 40. The verse is read without changes, e.g., also by Arthur Weiser, *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), p. 20; Bright (p. 13); Fischer (p. 149); Carroll (p. 136). For more details, see discussion below.

53. While van der Wal’s reading of the article (הַדֹּר אַתָּם) as a demonstrative is possible (“Such a generation you are!”; cf. *WHS* §87), his analogy with 2 Sam 12.7 (אַתָּה הָאִישׁ) draws from a phrase with a different word order; “Proposal,” p. 362. In seamless continuation with the 2mp-address in 2.29-30, the phrase reads well as it stands with a vocative article; cf. *WOC* §13.5.2c.

54. Instead of רָאִי, Jer-LXX reads ἀκούσατε which McKane (p. 52) regards as “a

- Have I been a wilderness to Israel,  
or a land of darkness?<sup>55</sup>  
Why have my people said:  
“We have gone our own way,<sup>56</sup> we will not come again to you”?
- 2.32 Does a maiden neglect her jewelry,  
or a bride her ribbons?  
Yet, my people have neglected me,<sup>57</sup>  
days without number.
- 2.33 How<sup>58</sup> well you make your way  
to seek love!  
Because of this, even for evil deeds<sup>59</sup>  
you have trained<sup>60</sup> your ways.
- 2.34 Even on the hem of your garments one can find  
the blood of needy and innocent lives,  
although you have not found<sup>61</sup> them breaking in.

---

normalizing of an unusual expression.” While Rudolph is correct that *seeing* YHWH’s word is “seltsam” (p. 18), the phrase must not be deleted (cf. Holladay: “Extreme though comprehensible”; p. 107). For ראה as “to consider,” see 2.23; 12.3; 20.12; *DCH* 7:350-351. As Fischer notes (p. 173), the verbs ראה and דבר are conjoined also in 23.18 (וַיִּרְא וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ); see also Exod 20.18, 22).

55. McKane (p. 52) and Holladay (p. 108) suggest that the *hapax legomena* מְאֶפְלִיָּה is a combination of אפל (“be dark;” cf. Job 3.6; Isa 29.18; Am 5.20) and יה, the shortened form of YHWH, which functions as a superlative. As Herrmann (p. 156) points out, however, “das angebliche Gottesnamenelement in מאפליה ist nicht gesichert.”

56. Several emendation have been proposed for רָדְנוּ (cf. *BHS*; McKane, p. 52). Although Jer-LXX (αὐτοῖς ἐπελάτουν) suggests רדה as root, deriving the verb from רוד (e.g., Hos 12.1) works well in parallel with בוֹא; so, e.g., also Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 127; Abma, *Marriage*, p. 226.

57. This rendering of הִתְשַׁכַּח and שָׁכַחוּנִי is explained in our discussion below.

58. For the exclamatory use of מה here and in 2.36, see *WHS* §126 and JM §144e.

59. With Jer-LXX (ἐπὶ στήθεσιν), Cornill (p. 28) and Holladay (“you’ve done ill”; p. 56) propose אֶת־הָרְעוֹת. This solution, however, denigrates the rhetorical force of לִכְנָן (see analysis below) and it scarcely suits the context to speak here of a woman teaching her ways to others (“evil women;” so, e.g., Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 40; Craigie, p. 42; KJV, RSV, ESV, NIV). What seems to be in view accusation in 2.34a are “evil things/deeds;” so, e.g., McKane, p. 53; Allen, p. 45.

60. *Pace* Volz (p. 30), K (לְמַדְתִּי) must be read here as an archaic 2fs-form (cf. *BHS*; Q: למדת). For למד (Pi.) as “to train,” see Abma, *Marriage*, pp. 277-278.

61. While Jer-LXX (εἶπον) renders מְצֹאֲתִים as a 1cs-verb (so, e.g., Duhm, p. 31; Volz, p. 32), most exegetes read here an archaic 2fs-form (e.g., Giesebrecht, p. 14; Weiser, p. 20; Holladay, p. 56; McKane, p. 49; Rudolph, p. 18). With Exod 22.1 in the background (see discussion below) and the consistent 2fs-perspective throughout 2.33-37, this reading is the better option.

- Yet, in spite of all of these things<sup>62</sup>
- 2.35 you said: “I am certainly innocent!  
Surely his anger has turned from me!”  
Behold, I am about to enter into judgment with you<sup>63</sup>  
because you have said: “I have not sinned.”
- 2.36 How much you go about<sup>64</sup>  
to change your way!  
Even by Egypt you will be shamed,  
just as you were shamed by Assyria.
- 2.37 Yes, from here you will go out<sup>65</sup>  
with your hands on your head.  
For YHWH has rejected those in whom you trust  
and you will not succeed by their help.<sup>66</sup>
- 3.1 So:<sup>67</sup> if a man sends off his wife  
and she goes away from him  
and becomes the wife of another man,  
can he return to her again?  
Would not that land<sup>68</sup> be utterly polluted?

62. The final phrase of 2.34 (כִּי עַל-כָּל-אַלֶּה) is often declared to be incomprehensible; so, e.g., Volz, p. 32; Rudolph, p. 18; Carroll, p. 139; for proposed emendations, see Barthélemy, *Critique*, pp. 474-475. J. Soggin has suggested a revocalization (אַלֶּה = terebinthe; cf. Jer-LXX: δρυί) which points to human sacrifices near “kanaanäischen Baumheiligtümern”; cf. “Einige Bemerkungen über Jeremias II, 34,” *VT* 8 (1958): 435. Holladay, on the other hand, reads the phrase as עֲלֶה לְאַלֶּה, thus evoking the yoke-language from 2.20; cf. “Jeremiah II 34bβ: A Fresh Approach,” *VT* 25 (1975): 221-225. Either suggestion, however, fits the context of 2.33-37 only with difficulty and it is preferable to take אֶלֶה to refer to “these things,” i.e., the accusations in 2.33-34 (cf. Lundbom, pp. 295-296) and to opt for a concessive translation of עַל (cf. *WHS* §288b).

63. For הנה + part. as an expression of immediate action, see WOC §37.6d and MNK §44.3.4ii. For causal עַל + inf. cons. (אֶמְרֶה), see WOC §36.2.2b.

64. Many commentators take Jer-LXX (κατεφρόνησας) as support for deriving תִּזְלִי from זלל (“to take lightly”) and repoint it as a Hi. form (תִּזְלִי); so, e.g., Rudolph, p. 18; Allen, p. 46; Holladay, p. 57. In light of the references to Egypt and Assur in 2.36b, the locative expression מֵאֶת הַנָּחַל in 2.37a, and דרך in the parallel phrase of 2.33a, אֶזל (“to go”) fits the context just as well; so, e.g., Fischer, pp. 150-151.

65. For this rendering of גם, see our discussion below. For זֶה as adverb of place, see *HALOT* 1:264.

66. While Peshitta and one Hebrew manuscript read בהם (cf. Jer-LXX: ἐν αὐτοῖς; cf. *BHS*), reading the preposition as a “לְ of specification” (lit. “with respect to”) makes an emendation unnecessary; so, e.g., Keil, p. 56; cf. *WHS* §273a.

67. For the headless לֹא־מֵר, see the discussion of demarcation above.

68. Pace McKane (pp. 58-59) and Volz (p. 35), the reading in Jer-LXX (ὅτι γὰρ ἐκείνη) should not be preferred in the place of הָאָרֶץ הַזֶּה. The combination אֶרֶץ + חָנִי reappears in 3.2

- And you, you have whored with many partners!  
Can you return to me?<sup>69</sup> —Speech of YHWH—
- 3.2 Lift up your eyes to the open country  
and see: where have you not been raped?<sup>70</sup>  
On the ways you have sat for them,  
like an Arab in the wilderness.  
You have polluted the land  
with your evil whoring.
- 3.3 The showers were withheld  
and the rains have not come.  
But you had the forehead of a whoring woman,  
you refused to be ashamed!
- 3.4 Have you not then  
called out<sup>71</sup> to me: “My Father!  
The partner of my youth are you!”<sup>72</sup>
- 3.5 Will he remain angry perpetually,  
even keep his fury forever?”  
Behold, you have spoken<sup>73</sup>  
and you have done evil things as much as you could!<sup>74</sup>

---

and the Greek version could be an attempt to maintain the “surface logic” (Craigie, p. 49) or an error (גלגל/גלגל; so, e.g., Carroll, p. 141).

69. While the inf. abs. שׁוֹב can be understood as an imptv. declaration (so Targum; cf. 2.2 and *WHS* §211), the parallel phrase הִשָּׁבוּ אֵלַי עוֹד and the indictment in 2.20-25, 33-37, and 3.2 make a rhetorical, resentful question much more likely; so, e.g., Ferdinand Hitzig, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (2d ed.; KEH 3; Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1866), p. 22; McKane, p. 59, with referral to GKC §113ee; Yates, “Message,” p. 152; Raymond C. Ortlund Jr., *God’s Unfaithful Wife: A Biblical Theology of Spiritual Adultery* (NSBT 2; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), p. 91.

70. For this division along the parallel terms שָׁאִי and וְרָאִי (contra *BHS*), see Walter T. W. Cloete, *Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah 2-25: Syntactical Constraints in Hebrew Colometry* (SBLDS 117; Atlanta: GA: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 106, 144-145. For K/Q שָׁגַל and the translation of שָׁפִים, see our discussion below.

71. Since reading K (קָרָאתִי) as a 1cs-verb yields a nonsensical reflexive statement, this is another case of an archaic 2fs-ending (cf. 2.33b) as indicated also by Q (קראת).

72. For the translation of הָלֹא מַעֲתָה and the appellation אֱלֹהִי, see our discussion below.

73. As in 2.33b and 3.4a, דְּבַרְתִּי (K) reflects an archaic 2fs-ending (cf. Q [דברת]).

74. Regardless whether the final waw-conjunctive is regarded as epexegetical (cf. WOC §33.2.2) or comparative (cf. *WHS* §437), וְתוֹכַל indicates that the evil deeds were committed to the highest degree possible; cf. 2.33b (אֶת־הָרְעוֹת לַמִּדָּתִי). So, e.g., Duhm (“bis zum Äussersten”; p.

#### 4. Text Analysis

Due to its scarcity of explicit address forms and introductory formulas, 2.1-3.5 appears at first sight as one seamless block of discourse.<sup>75</sup> At a closer look, however, YHWH's speech can be demarcated into several distinct units which are set off from each other by means of shifts in address and gender, imperatives, questions, and other such indicators. In order to define the relevant frame for each speech quotation in the composition, it is necessary to discuss the boundaries and the internal arrangement of these units. This discussion will inevitably touch on some of the thematic and rhetorical features of 2.1-3.5; however, a full treatment of these aspects is reserved for the analyses in the next chapters. What will receive closer attention, however, are the communication structures of the passage, that is, the changes and interrelationship between the entities *to* whom YHWH talks (addressees) and *about* whom he talks (referents). These dynamics play a significant role in the demarcation of the individual units and, as argued in the previous chapter, are also crucial for the integration of the speech quotations.

##### 4.1. Jeremiah 2.1-3

The first unit of 2.1-3.5 begins with the prophet's reception of YHWH's word (וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי, v. 1) and ends before the shift to plural address in 2.4 (שָׁמְעוּ וְקִרְאתָ בְּאָזְנִי (דְּבַר־יְהוָה (ירושלם). In 2.2, YHWH commands Jeremiah to address Jerusalem (ירושלם). This verse marks the first instance of the 2fs-address which makes up a large portion of the rest of the passage (cf. 2.16-25, 33-37; 3.1-5). In 2.3, the

---

35), Bright ("to your utmost"; p. 19), Rudolph ("mit Meisterschaft"; p. 20), Craigie (p. 49), Carroll (p. 141). For the incongruence of וְהוֹכֵל (masculine) after דְּבַר־יְהוָה (feminine), see, e.g., GKC §69r, 145t, Giesebrecht ("vielleicht nur ein Schreibfehler"; p. 16) and Holladay ("a valid though rare pattern"; p. 116).

75. Cf. Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*: "Ein scheinbar uferloser Fluß der Rede"; p. 34.

referent **יִשְׂרָאֵל** appears in conjunction with a masculine suffix (**כָּל-אֹכְלֵיוֹ**).<sup>76</sup>

Contrary to the reading of some exegetes,<sup>77</sup> this verse does not introduce another addressee: YHWH does not speak *to* Israel but *about* Israel. Since there is no switch in addressee, 2.2-3 records a speech by YHWH to Jerusalem in which he tells the city about Israel.<sup>78</sup> In its introductory position, the explicit identification of the 2fs-addressee as Jerusalem establishes the personified city as the recipient of YHWH's address for all subsequent feminine sections in 2.1-3.5.<sup>79</sup>

### Excursus: Jerusalem as YHWH's Feminine Addressee

Across the exegetical literature on 2.1-3.5, YHWH's 2fs-addressee is commonly identified as Israel.<sup>80</sup> While Duhm surmised that the prophet in the feminine

---

76. Some exegetes regard this switch from address to referent as an indication of literary growth (e.g., Herrmann, p. 110). Yet, as Hardmeier points out "solche Übergänge sind nun aber für die ganze Komposition charakteristisch. Wie in 2.3 wird z.B. auch in 2.14 und 31 gerade von Israel in der dritten Person gesprochen, jeweils gefolgt von Du-Anreden im sing."; "Redekomposition," p. 22. McKane (p. 26; similar Nicholson, p. 29) translates **כָּל-אֹכְלֵיוֹ** as "Any who ate her" to homogenize the feminine gender across 2.1-3. Carroll (p. 118; similar Allen, p. 35) opts for "all who ate of it." Since both **רֵאשִׁית** and **תְּבוּאָתָהּ** are feminine nouns, however, they cannot be the antecedents of **אֹכְלֵיוֹ**. The reference to the wilderness wandering (**הַלֵּךְ + מִדְבָּר**) identifies **יִשְׂרָאֵל** as the whole nation rather than the northern kingdom; cf. Abma, *Marriage*, p. 237.

77. E.g., Liwak, *Geschichte*, p. 172; van der Wal, "Proposal," p. 361; Konrad Schmid, *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30-33 im Kontext des Buches* (WMANT 72; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), p. 142; Maggie Low, *Mother Zion in Deutero-Isaiah: A Metaphor for Zion Theology* (StudBibLit 155; New York: Peter Lang, 2013), p. 57.

78. So, e.g., Fischer ("Die Nennung von 'Israel' innerhalb einer Anrede an 'Jerusalem'"; p. 155) and Herrmann ("V. 2 und 3 sind an Jerusalem gerichtet"; p. 106).

79. Cf. Ezek 16.2.: **הוֹדַע אֶת-יְרוּשָׁלַם**. In order to identify Jerusalem as the feminine addressee in the unfolding discourse, this fronted position makes it unnecessary for her to be named again; *pace* Böhler, "Geschlechterdifferenz," p. 105, Herrmann, "Prophet," p. 205; Albertz, "Frühzeitverkündigung," p. 26. In support of this reading, see Hardmeier, "Redekomposition," p. 23; Julie Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife* (SBLDS 130; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 54-55.

80. Except for the nuanced treatments by Herrmann (p. 99), Carroll (p. 119), and Fischer (pp. 154-155), every commentary published on Jeremiah adopts this interpretation. Alternatively, some interpreters have suggested the Jerusalemites as the addressee; e.g., Calvin (p. 69), Schmidt (p. 67), Craigie (p. 23); HRD: "den Bewohnern Jerusalems"; Targum: **עָמָא**



passage of 2.16ff “wahrscheinlich als Adressaten die בְּתֻעָמִי dachte, die er später öfter nennt,” the persona of Jerusalem in prophetic literature has come into focus more explicitly in a number of recent studies.<sup>81</sup> Of particular significance for 2.1-3.5 is Steck’s discussion of Jerusalem’s autonomous and relational status. The city, so Steck, is not a symbol for the people and should not be equated with them. Rather, as a feminine figure in her own right, she stands in a “zweifachen personalen Relation: hinsichtlich Jahwes und hinsichtlich der Menschen.”<sup>82</sup> In addition to the cultural and literary evidence accrued by Steck and others, the identification of the woman in 2.1-3.5 as Jerusalem is promoted from within the book itself:

1. Israel is never spoken to or spoken about as a woman and Judah is never addressed in such terms either.<sup>83</sup>

---

דְּבִירוֹשָׁלַם. See, however, Liwak, *Geschichte*: “Der Ort, an dem Jeremia die Rede hält, ist nach 2.2 Jerusalem. Daß damit zugleich auch die Bewohner Jerusalems die eigentlichen Ansprechpartner sind, ist nicht gesagt”; p. 172.

81. Cf. Duhm, p. 23 (for בְּתֻעָמִי, see the Jerusalem-texts in 4.11-14 and 6.23-26). Cf. Julius Lewy, “The Old West Semitic Sun-God Hammu,” *HUCA* 18 (1943): 429-488; Aloysius Fitzgerald, “The Mythological Background for the Presentation of Jerusalem as a Queen and False Worship as Adultery in the OT,” *CBQ* 34 (1972): 403-416; “*BTWLT* and *BT* as Titles for Capital Cities,” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 167-183; John J. Schmitt, “Israel and Zion: Two Gendered Images: Biblical Speech Traditions and their Contemporary Neglect,” *Hor* 18 (1991): 20-22, 28-30; “The Gender of Ancient Israel,” *JSOT* 26 (1983): 115-125; Biddle, “The Figure of Lady Jerusalem: Identification, Deification, and Personification of Cities in the Ancient Near East, in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective: Scripture in Context IV* (ANETS 11; eds. K. Lawson Younger Jr., William W. Hallo, Bernard F. Batto; Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1991), pp. 173-187. For Jer 2, see especially Wischnowsky, *Zion*, pp. 112-146; Hardmeier, “Redekomposition,” pp. 21-23; Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 68-71; Galambush, *City*, pp. 53-57; Sarah J. Dille, *Mixing Metaphors: God as Mother and Father in Deutero-Isaiah* (JSOTSup 398; London: T&T Clark, 2004), p. 155. In addition to the texts from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, see also Mic 4.8-5.5; 7.8-13; Zeph 3.14-18; Tob 13.9; Bar 4.30-5.6; Gal 4.21-31.

82. Odil H. Steck, “Zion als Gelände und Gestalt: Überlegungen zur Wahrnehmung Jerusalems als Stadt und Frau im Alten Testament,” *ZThK* 86 (1989): 263. “Man zerstört die besonderen Sinnakzente dieser Texte, wenn man die personalen Stadtaussagen einfach in die Bewohner- oder Volksaussagen auflöst”; *ibid.*, p. 272. So also Biddle, *Polyphony*, p. 9. For examples of such confections in Jer 2, see, e.g., Schmidt, p. 80; Shields, *Circumscribing*, p. 15; Diamond and O’Connor, “Passions,” p. 128.

83. The 125 occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל yield an unambiguously masculine depiction (see, e.g., 2.3, 14; 4.1; 14.8; 23.6; 31.2; 50.19); cf. Schmitt, “Israel and Zion,” “The Gender of Ancient Israel,” Steck, “Zion”: “Israel ist generisch eben nie so konstruiert”; p. 272. The title בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל in 18.13, 31.4, and 31.21 is not to be equated with יִשְׂרָאֵל and does not appear in 2.1-3.5; cf. Fitzgerald, “Mythological,” p. 404; Schmitt, “The Virgin of Israel: Referent and Use of the Phrase in Amos and Jeremiah,” *CBQ* 53 (1991): 365-380. As in other prophetic books, Judah’s gender is more

2. The city plays a significant role in Jer 1 and is thus a suitable recipient of YHWH's address in Jer 2.<sup>84</sup>
3. There are a number of lexical links between the 2fs-material in 2.1-3.5 and other city-texts in Jeremiah.<sup>85</sup>
4. Jerusalem is frequently mentioned separately from Judah and its cities.<sup>86</sup>

Based on these indicators and the support amassed by the exegetes listed in this section, YHWH's feminine addressee in 2.1-3.5 will be understood throughout this study as the personified city. She is a character who stands in relationship with the people—they are her children (בְּנֵי עִבּוֹנִי, cf. 5.7)—and shares in their past (e.g., the wilderness episode),<sup>87</sup> and yet she must be recognized as

---

flexible: feminine in 13.19, 14.2, 23.6a, and 33.16; masculine in 2.28; 8.1; 11.13; 17.1; 20.4; 31.23-24; 44.9; 52.3, 27; cf. Julia M. O'Brien, "Judah as Wife and Husband: Deconstructing Gender in Malachi," *JBL* 115 (1996): 241-250. In all of Jeremiah, there is not a single feminine address to Judah and 2.1-3.5 confronts Judah as a masculine entity (2.28). The sister-comparison in 3.6-11 is unique in its feminine personification of countries rather than cities and its rhetorical juxtaposition between the northern and southern kingdom relates to a subject matter that is distinct from 2.1-3.5; cf. Galambush, *City*, p. 56; Wischnowsky, *Zion*, p. 105; Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*, pp. 106-107. Jerusalem is always feminine in Jeremiah, regardless whether YHWH speaks *to* her (4.14, 18; 5.1, 7; 6.8, 23, 26; 13.27; 15.5) and *about* her (4.29-31; 6.1-3, 6; 33.16; 38.28; 51.35).

84. Cf. 1.1-3, 15. A few scholars have noted a connection between Jerusalem and the prophet's characterization as a fortified city (לְעִיר מְבֻצָּר) in 1.17-19; cf. Carroll, p. 109; Peter Riede, *Ich Mache Dich zur Festen Stadt: Zum Prophetenbild von Jeremia 1.18f und 15.20* (FzB 121; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2009), p. 87; see also Fischer, "Ich Mache Dich. . . zur Eisernen Säule (Jer 1.18): Der Prophet als Besserer Ersatz für den Untergegangenen Tempel," *ZKTh* 116 (1994): 447-450; U. Mauser, *Gottesbild und Menschwerdung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), p. 92.

85. The lexeme כָּבַס occurs only in 2.22 (כִּי אִם-תִּכְבֹּסֶי) and 4.14 (כִּבְסֵי מִרְעָה לְבָד יְרוּשָׁלַם). See also יָסַר in 2.19/6.8 and the combinations of לָךְ + עָשָׂה in 2.17/4.18 and מָר + רָע in 2.19/4.18. Note further the address to Jerusalem in 22.20-23 which references רָעַתָּךְ (cf. 2.19), אָהֶב (cf. 2.25, 33), and בּוֹשׁ (cf. 2.36). For other lexical connections, see Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 71. These links are not taken into considerations in the counter-arguments by Schmid, *Buchgestalten* (p. 142) and Bozak *Life "Anew": A Literary-Theological Study of Jer. 30-31* (AnBib 122; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), p. 156.

86. See, e.g., 1.15; 4.4-5, 16; 7.17, 34; 9.10; 11.2, 6, 9, 12; 13.9; 14.2; 17.20; 18.11; 25.2.

87. The reading advanced here is at times disputed on the ground that the city "nicht hinter YHWH in der Wüste lief" (Duhm, p. 16). So also Cornill, p. 15; Böhler, "Geschlechterdifferenz," p. 106; Finsterbusch, "Kommunikationsebenen," p. 252; Abma, *Marriage*, p. 246. It must be noted, however, that YHWH's reference "from her youth" is attested also in the Jerusalem-text in 22.21 and that the image of Jerusalem as bride appears also in Isa 62.5 and still in the New Testament era (Rev 21.1-2). Cf. Galambush, *City*: "The addressee [in 2.2-3] is unquestionably Jerusalem, . . . the capital city thus metonymously represents the entire nation, apparently including the life of that nation before it had Jerusalem as its capital"; pp.

“Trägerin eigener, für sie bestimmter theologischer Aussagen.”<sup>88</sup>

### Excursus finit.

In 2.1-3, YHWH recalls (זָכַרְתִּי) the faithfulness of Jerusalem’s youth and the love of her bridal days. These references have led some exegetes to speak of a “honeymoon period” between YHWH and his feminine addressee,<sup>89</sup> the text, however, does not necessarily support this interpretation. As Krüger has pointed out, the passage describes the woman “nicht ausdrücklich als ‘Braut’ Jahwes” and the use of its marital language is rhetorical rather than referential.<sup>90</sup> By virtue of its position at the head of 2.1-3.5 and the explicit references to favourable memories (לְךָ; “for your sake”) and past protection (v. 3),<sup>91</sup> the address functions primarily as a rhetorical foil. It elevates YHWH’s benevolent character and sets up a reference point against which the following depictions of unfaithfulness are magnified.

## 4.2. Jeremiah 2.4-13

As the discourse continues, we encounter our first two quotations in 2.6 and 2.8

---

53-54.

88. Steck, “Zion,” p. 281.

89. See, e.g., Allen, p. 33; Fretheim, p. 63; Carroll, p. 119; Louis Stulman, *Jeremiah* (AOTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2005), p. 48; Nelly Sienstra, *YHWH is the Husband of his People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), pp. 162-163; Diamond and O’Connor, “Passions,” p. 131. Some exegetes have argued that חסד and אהבת in 2.2 are YHWH’s attributes; see, e.g., Fox, “Jeremiah 2.2 and the ‘Desert Ideal,’” *CBQ* 35 (1973): 441-450; Wanke, p. 34. This has, however, been refuted by Wischnowsky, *Zion* (p. 116), and Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea* (pp. 126-18).

90. Cf. Thomas Krüger, “Jahwe und die Götter in Jeremia 2,” in *Schriftprophetie* (FS Jörg Jeremias; eds. Friedhelm Hartenstein, Jutta Krispenz, Aaron Scharf; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), p. 187. See further Carroll (p. 119), Moughtin-Mumby (*Sexual*, pp. 95-96), and Patrick D. Miller: “The words are a setup. They clearly presuppose more to follow”; *The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (NIB 6; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2001), p. 598.

91. For ל + זכר, see Schottroff, *Gedenken*: “Das Gedenken an die Treue und Verbundenheit Israels bestimmte Jahwe zu segensvollem und heilbedeutendem Bezug zu Israel. Jetzt aber haben sich die Dinge verschoben: Israel erweist Jahwe kein חסד mehr, dessen er gedenken und den er mit Segen entgelten könnte”; p. 233.

which are both framed as *irrealis* speech (לֹא אָמְרוּ). The unit in which these insets occur is demarcated by the address in 2.4 and the summary statement of Israel's "twofold evil" in 2.13 (בִּי-שְׁתֵּימָּה רָעוֹת עָשָׂה עַמִּי).<sup>92</sup> Within these boundaries, the role of verse 9 is ambiguous. Some commentators prefer to read it with 2.10-13, yet there are several reasons why it should be connected to 2.4-8:

1. The conjunction לָכֵן which opens 2.9 reads most naturally as a conclusion.
2. After the mention of the fathers (v. 5) and the present generation (אֲתָכֶם, v. 7), the reference to future generations (בְּנֵי בְנֵיכֶם, v. 9) completes the line of thought.
3. With a total of five imperatives, 2.10 gives ample indication of a new stage in the discourse.

The frame of the quotations in 2.6 and 2.8 must consequently be defined as 2.4-9. Nevertheless, as the material of 2.10-13 is closely related to this section (cf. conjunctive כִּי in 2.10), the insights from our study of the quotations will be applied to it in our discussion below.

While the boundaries of this unit can thus be determined by discourse markers, such as vocatives, questions, and conjunctions, 2.4-13 is unified and set apart from 2.1-3 and 2.14ff also by virtue of its communication structure. In distinction to the 2fs-address to Jerusalem in 2.2-3, YHWH speaks here to "the House of Jacob" and "all the clans of the House of Israel" (v. 4). Contrary to what Albertz and others have suggested, the references to the fathers, the Exodus, and the conquest in 2.5-7 indicate that these two titles do not address the northern kingdom alone but the people of Israel as a whole.<sup>93</sup> Since, however, the political

---

92. Correspondingly, the אִם + מִדּוּעַ construction in 2.14 indicates the beginning of a new section; cf. 8.19; 14.19; 22.28. For the structuring function of rhetorical questions, see Lénart de Regt, "Discourse Implications of Rhetorical Questions in Job, Deuteronomy, and the Minor Prophets," in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (eds. de Regt, J. de Waard, J. P. Fokkelman; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996), pp. 64-76.

93. In Albertz's view (cf. "Frühzeitverkündigung"), 2.4-4.2 is addressed to the north and 4.3-6.30 speaks to the south. This hypothesis, however, has been thoroughly criticized; see, e.g.,

union of the nation has been disrupted (cf. 1 Kgs 12) and since Jer 1-2 singles out Judah and Jerusalem as the book's addressees (cf. 1.15, 18; 2.2, 28), we conclude that 2.4-13 speaks to Judah, the remaining southern kingdom, within the grand panorama of Israel's history.<sup>94</sup>

As with the address to the city in 2.1-3, the address to the people likewise draws from the history of a unified nation.<sup>95</sup> This twofold rhetorical analogy is founded on the fact that Jerusalem shares in the history of her children and that the Judahites *as Israelites* partake in it. Whereas Israel was but an entity about whom YHWH talked in 2.1-3, now the people themselves are being addressed. YHWH has spoken to Jerusalem in terms of and about Israel's past (vv. 2-3) and the unit of 2.4-13 continues this historical address and object lesson for the people of Judah. As we will see, this switch in address between Jerusalem and Judah and the rhetoric of comparing the city and the people to the fate of the referent **יִשְׂרָאֵל** will continue throughout 2.1-3.5.<sup>96</sup>

Already from this brief overview of structure and communication, several crucial questions come to light with respect to the quotations in 2.6 and 2.8: what is the purpose of their negative formulation at this early stage of the

---

Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 17-23; Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, *Die Ferne Gottes: Studien zum Jeremiabuch: Beiträge zu den "Konfessionen" im Jeremiabuch und ein Versuch zur Frage nach den Anfängen der Jeremiatradition* (BZAW 179; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), pp. 115-127; Sweeney, "Redaction," pp. 204-205; J. Gordon McConville, *Judgment and Promise: An Interpretation of the Book of Jeremiah* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), pp. 39-43; Levin, *Verheißung*, p. 158; Herrmann, pp. 107-109. Much of this criticism applies also to Holladay's north-theory (pp. 62-77). In regard to this discussion, it is important to note that the address **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** is used elsewhere in Jeremiah for Judah (cf. 18.6) and that **יְעֻקֵּב** is likewise an inclusive term (see especially Nelson Kilpp, *Niederreißen und Aufbauen: Das Verhältnis von Heilsverheißung und Unheilsverkündigung bei Jeremia und im Jeremiabuch* [BTS 13; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990], pp. 113-114).

94. So, e.g., also McKane: "The prophet speaks to Judah and Jerusalem, but there is continuity in the concept 'Israel', despite the consequences of political brokenness"; p. 31. Abma talks of a strategy "to address Judah in the broad perspective of the nation as a whole and 'as' Israel"; *Marriage*, p. 237. See also Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 19; Van der Wal, "Proposal," p. 360.

95. Cf. Sweeney, "Redaction": "Israel serves as an analogy for Jerusalem and Judah"; p. 211.

96. Cf. Hardmeier, "Redekomposition": "Zweizügige Auffächerung der Anrede"; p. 21.

discourse? How do they function between the temporal shifts across 2.5, 7, and 9? How do they contribute to the comparative rhetoric of the unit? The discussion of these and other questions will occupy us in detail in our analysis below.

### 4.3. Jeremiah 2.14-25

Most interpreters agree that the rhetorical construction in 2.14 forms the starting point of this unit. The question of its closure, however, is debated and requires some attention in view of the fact that quoted insets appear in 2.20, 23, 25, and 27. Although 2.20-28 is commonly regarded as a coherent section,<sup>97</sup> there are a number of good reasons for drawing the line between verses 25 and 26. Above all, the switching of gender and number points in this direction: whereas 2.16-25 is set in 2fs-address to the personified Jerusalem (cf. 2.1-3),<sup>98</sup> 2.26-27 is phrased as a 3mp-account, 2.28 contains 2ms-address (אֵלֶיךָ), and 2.29-31 records 2mp-address. The structuring implications of this communicative differentiation are supported by the concentric arrangement of 2.23-25, the switch from the metaphors in 2.20-25 to the simile in 2.26 (כְּבִשֶׁת), and the recurrence of the entity יְשׁוּעָה in 2.26 which had already opened both preceding units (vv. 4, 14).<sup>99</sup> Conversely, the case for 2.20-28 at times ascribes

---

97. The reasons to delineate 2.20-28 vary. Brueggemann (p. 38) sees 2.20-28 as an indictment and 2.29-37 as the sentence; Lundbom (p. 275) points to the formula in 2.19 and the *setumah* after 2.28.

98. Cf. Biddle, *Redaction*: "This, at first appearance unnamed, female figure may best be identified as the personified city of Jerusalem"; p. 57. So also Wischnowsky (*Zion*; pp. 117, 122-123, 144) and Hardmeier ("Geschichte," p. 15). See further the link between 2.17 and the specified Jerusalem address in 4.18.

99. The metaphor/simile contrast was first pointed out by Holladay, *The Architecture of Jeremiah 1-20* (London: Associated University Presses, 1976), p. 39. In 2.20-25, the animal metaphor (vv. 23b-24) is framed by 2fs-imptv. phrases (vv. 23aβ and 25a) and 2fs-speech quotations (vv. 23aα and 25b). This chiasm is treated in more detail below and has recently been discussed by Rom-Shiloni, "How can you say, 'I am not defiled. . .?'" (Jeremiah 2.20-25): Allusion to Priestly Legal Traditions in the Poetry of Jeremiah," *JBL* 133 (2014): 758-759. For other

too much significance to the formula נָא־מֵאֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת which appears in 2.19. Similar to 2.10 and 2.13, the formula is immediately followed by the conjunction כִּי, thus joining the discourse of 2.14-19 with that of 2.20-25.<sup>100</sup> This interrelationship is further indicated by the theme of servitude (לֹא/עֶבֶד, v. 14/אֶעֱבֹד, v. 20), the parallel imperative strings, and the keyword דֶּרֶךְ.<sup>101</sup> On the basis of the sustained communication structure and these thematic and verbal connections, it is preferable to treat 2.14-25, similar to 2.4-13, as one cohesive unit with two interrelated halves. Within 2.14-19, the onset of the 2fs-address marks 2.16-19 as a sub-division; within 2.20-25, the chiasm of 2.23-25 and the question particle אִי in 2.23 suggest another division.

Embedded within these structural boundaries, the quotations in 2.20, 23, and 25 necessitate a unified treatment distinct from those in 2.27. A first glance at their location reveals some peculiar characteristics. For instance, the first inset is placed in the opening verse and the other two instances are juxtaposed in the concentric structure of 2.23-25. Moreover, the quotation in 2.25b is assigned the final position in this unit. Before we turn to these aspects, however, the interrelationship between 2.14-19 and 2.20-25 and the conjunctive כִּי which connects both sections prompts us to preface our analysis of the three insets with an examination of 2.14-19. The purpose of the three quotations of Jerusalem in the latter half of 2.14-25 cannot be adequately grasped without attention to YHWH's arguments and accusation in the section that precedes it.

---

arguments against the demarcation of 2.20-28, see especially Schultz-Rauch, *Hosea*, p. 34.

100. Holladay (p. 97) has argued that translating כִּי as "For" is not possible because 2.19 marks a closure. He chooses "Look" instead (cf. Bozak: "Indeed"; "Heeding," pp. 526-527). However, the particular formula in 2.19 occurs only twice more in Jeremiah, being placed either midway in the clause (49.5) or midway in the line (50.31). As our analysis will show, 2.20-25 explicate the reasons that underlie Jerusalem's failure to fear YHWH (v. 19). So, e.g., also Allen, p. 47; Carroll, p. 130; Wischnowsky, *Zion*, p. 120; Weiser, p. 25.

101. דַּעִי (cf. 3.13; 6.18) and רָאִי (cf. 3.2; 13.20) appear elsewhere in Jeremiah, yet they are conjoined only in 2.19 and 2.23 (and in 1 Sam 25.17). The lexeme דֶּרֶךְ occurs in 2.1-3.5 only in the 2fs-material (2.17, 18, 23, 33, 36; 3.2).

#### 4.4. Jeremiah 2.26-32

The clearest indicator for the distinct nature of 2.26-32 is the 2fs-address in 2.16-25 and 2.33-3.5 against which its masculine address, singular and plural, stands in marked contrast.<sup>102</sup> As previously in the discourse, the boundary to the next unit is indicated by a question (מִה־תִּיטֹבִי; v. 33; cf. 2.14, 23) and also by the peculiar structural cohesion of 2.33-37 (see below). This demarcation is affirmed by the internal arrangement of 2.26-32. Similar to the role of 2.9 within 2.4-13, YHWH's declaration in 2.29 functions as a janus between the sub-division of 2.26-28 and 2.30-32.<sup>103</sup> Although we will read 2.29 in conjunction with 2.30-32—it poses a new question (לָמָּה) and shares the 2mp-address of 2.30-31a<sup>104</sup>—it indicates the structural parallelism of these seven verses: both units start with a simile (כְּבִשָּׁת, v. 26/כָּאֲרִיָּה, v. 30), contain a quotation in medial position (v. 27/v. 31), and end with a question and numerical reference (+ וְאַיֶּיָּה, v. 28/וְהַתְּשִׁיבָה + מִסְפָּר, v. 32).

The communication structures of address and reference further confirm the cohesion of 2.26-32. After the speech quotation of Jerusalem in 2.25b has brought the previous unit to its close, 2.26a refers immediately to the entity בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, thus posing a direct parallel to the opening of 2.4-13 and 2.14-25. Possibly because of its fronted position, several interpreters understand “House

---

102. Duhm's bold proposal (p. 29) to emend all verbs in 2.26-32 to 2fs-forms reflects this contrast.

103. Cf. Schmidt: “V. 29b hat eine *doppelte* Aufgabe oder ist nach zwei Seiten ausgerichtet;” (emphasis original), p. 95; see also Liwak (*Geschichte*, p. 177) and Holladay (*Architecture*, p. 42). Both 2.9 and 2.29 contain the lexeme רִיב and 2.4-13 and 2.26-32 share several other links (for an overview, see Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 129-130). The significance of these parallels is explored in our analysis below.

104. The sub-division 2.29-32 is found also in Allen (p. 49), Bright (p. 18), Biddle (*Redaction*, p. 128), Carroll (pp. 136-138), Condamin (p. 19), Craigie (pp. 39-41), Fischer (pp. 172-174), Holladay (p. 71), Nicholson (pp. 38-39), and Volz (p. 29). It is suggested also by the *setumah* after 2.28, the only massoretic marker within 2.4-3.5.



of Israel” here as the addressee of 2.26ff.<sup>105</sup> But in view of the 3mp-verb **הִיָּשׁוּ** in 2.26a, the pronoun **הֵמָּה** in 2.26b, and the 3mp-verbs in 2.27 (**יֹאמְרוּ**; **פָּנּוּ**), this cannot be the case. The referent **יִשְׂרָאֵל** occurs as in 2.3 and 2.14 in third-person discourse and the identification of the addressee is delayed until the third verse of the unit (cf. v. 16).<sup>106</sup> YHWH’s speech about Israel’s shame (v. 26) and quoted words (v. 27) thus must be understood as integral elements of his speech to Judah (**הָיָיוּ אֶלֶיָּהּ יְהוּדָה**, v. 28b) who is addressed in this way via the analogy of the whole nation.<sup>107</sup> This comparative mode of argumentation, reminiscent of the dynamics in 2.4-13, continues in 2.29-32. Parallel to the interplay of address and reference in 2.26-28, the people of Judah, here addressed with 2mp-verbs (**תְּרִיבוּ** **פִּשְׁעֵהֶם**), are pointed in these verses to the negative example of Israel’s attitude and speech (**אָמְרוּ עָמִי**, v. 31). In addition to our analysis of the quoted insets within their frames of 2.26-28 and 2.29-32, this arrangement prompts us to pay close attention to their employment within these communicative and comparative dynamics.

#### 4.5. Jeremiah 2.33-37

With the return to 2fs-address, the new question in 2.32, and the lone **לֹא־אָמַר** in 3.1, the boundaries of 2.33-37 are readily available.<sup>108</sup> These indicators are

---

105. Cf. Biddle, *Redaction*: “So shall you be ashamed, house of Israel”; p. 124. In Böhler’s view, 2.26ff “nennt die Angesprochenen gleich im ersten Satz ‘Haus Israel,’” “Geschlechterdifferenz,” p. 109. See further Herrmann (“Worte an Israel”; p. 149) and Finsterbusch (cf. “Kommunikationsebenen,” p. 251).

106. Cf. Hardmeier, “Redekomposition”: “Wie die Anfänge der beiden Redeteile (in V 14f und 31aβ.32) kehrt auch V. 26b wieder zur beschreibenden Rede über Israel zurück”; p. 26. This passage is included in Watson’s discussion of “Delayed Identification”; cf. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSup 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), p. 337.

107. Herrmann understands the mention of Judah in 2.28 as an “Ergänzung aus einer Arbeitsphase, in der Worte an Israel auf einen gesamtisraelischen Hintergrund gestellt werden sollten”; p. 149. Abma describes 2.14-15 and 2.26-28 as “transitional passages in third person speech” (*Marriage*, p. 238), yet provides no explanation how these sections relate to YHWH’s address in the surrounding discourse.

108. So, e.g., Allen (pp. 50-51), Carroll (pp. 138-140), Condamin (p. 20), Craigie (pp. 42-45), Fischer (pp. 174-176), Holladay (p. 71), Lundbom (pp. 293-297), and McKane (pp.

confirmed as in the previous units by the internal structure of these verses (/מה/גם in vv. 33-34 and vv. 36-37). Contrasting the complex dynamics between addressee and referent in YHWH's speech in 2.26-32, the communication layout of 2.33-37 is much more lucid. As the frame of 2.20-25, the unit is composed entirely of YHWH's speech to Jerusalem who is once again identified by the 2fs-address (cf. v. 2). Couched between the two movements of questions (מה) and particles (גם) which unite and define 2.33-37, this address contains two quotations of Jerusalem which are located in 2.35. This notable position in the central verse of the unit indicates that our analysis must determine not only the interrelationship between the two individual insets but also their role within the peculiar, parallel frame of 2.33-34 and 2.36-37.

#### 4.6. Jeremiah 3.1-5

Set off from the coherent structure of 2.33-37, the marker **לְאמֹר** and the introduction of an extended legal discussion denotes the beginning of a new unit at 3.1. As argued in our demarcation of 2.1-3.5, this unit ends before the speech formula in 3.6. Internally, 3.1-5 is unified by recurring keywords (רַע, vv. 1b, 2b, 5b; זָנָה, vv. 1b, 2b, 3b), double-questions (cf. vv. 1, 4-5), and an inclusio (הֵן/הִנֵּה, vv. 1a, 5b).<sup>109</sup> These lexical and structural markers unfold across YHWH's address to Jerusalem (e.g., וְאַתָּה, v. 1; מֵאַתָּה, v. 3; וְהִתְעַשִּׂי, v. 5). By virtue of this recurrence of the 2fs-address but also through its use of double imperatives (v. 2), questions (vv. 1a, 4-5), and quoted speech (vv. 4-5a), the final unit of 2.1-3.5 closely resembles the configuration of 2.20-25 and 2.33-37. Differing from these

---

53-57). Reading across the switch of address and gender, Bright regards 2.29-37 as a unit (pp. 13-14) and Finsterbusch understands the imptv. רָאָה to indicate the beginning of 2.31-37; cf. "Kommunikationsebenen," p. 254.

109. For these and others markers of the unity of 3.1-5, see Holladay (*Architecture*, p. 52) and Lundbom (pp. 299-300).

units, however, 3.1-5 integrates only one quoted inset which is placed towards the end of its discourse (vv. 4-5a). In view of this position, it remains to be resolved how the legal scenario in 3.1, the accusations in 3.2-3, and YHWH's closing response in 3.5b frame Jerusalem's final quotation.

## 5. Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was to determine the frame of each individual inset in 2.1-3.5. After the foundational exercises of demarcation and translation, this task was carried out in form of a text analysis which has produced an overview of the structural arrangement of the passage and the locations and interrelationships of its quotations. As a summary of our discussion and in preparation for the analyses in the coming chapters, the following chart presents the distribution of the quotations and the delimitation of their units:

Units	Sub-units	Quoted Insets
2.1-3	-	-
2.4-13	2.4-9	2.6a (וְלֹא אָמְרוּ) + 2.8a (לֹא אָמְרוּ)
	2.10-13	-
2.14-25	2.14-15	-
	2.16-19	-
	2.20-22	2.20a (וְתֹאמְרֵי)
	2.23-25	2.23a (תֹּאמְרֵי) + 2.25b (וְתֹאמְרֵי)
2.26-32	2.26-28	2.27a (אֲמָרִים) + 2.27b (יֹאמְרוּ)
	2.29-32	2.31b (אָמְרוּ)
2.33-37	-	2.35a (וְתֹאמְרֵי) + 2.35b (עַל-אָמְרָךְ)
3.1-5	-	3.4-5a (קְרֹאתִי)

To provide the depth and detail that a context-oriented analysis of quoted speech requires, we will devote an individual chapter to each of the five distinct units in which the quotations appear: 2.4-13; 2.14-25; 2.26-32; 2.33-37; 3.1-5.

In addition to defining the framing parameters of the quotations, our

text analysis has provided other important insights for our study. First, the close attention to the configuration of the passage has affirmed our initial remarks about its complexity and cohesion. By virtue of reappearing forms of address and gender and various syntactical, lexical, and thematic links, 2.1-3.5 is fused into one coherent whole in which each unit stands in relation to its surroundings.<sup>110</sup> Obvious examples are the sustained 2fs-address or the parallels between the masculine address portions in 2.4-13 and 2.26-32. This scenario demands that all sections must be taken into consideration, even those which record no instances of quoted speech (cf. 2.1-3, 10-13, 14-19). While our analyses are focused on the immediate frame of each quoted inset, the cohesive configuration of 2.1-3.5 further suggests that we compare our observations at times with other units. Rather than five isolated discussions in sequence, the analytical program is thus to be understood more accurately as a constant interplay between the whole and its parts. Building on the observations throughout this analysis, the summary at the end of this study (chapter nine) will formulate a unified portrayal of the discourse and quotations of 2.1-3.5.

Second, even at the preliminary level of our structural analysis, we have come to see the significance of the question of location. Woven between temporal shifts in 2.4-9, located as the finale of the unit of 2.20-25, or placed at the centre of two parallel structures in 2.35, our inquiry needs to pay special attention to these particulars of placement. A quotation evidently plays a different role at the head of a frame than at its closure and so it is vital to probe the framing relationship in each individual case.

Third, our discussion has highlighted the analytical significance of the

---

110. Cf. Fischer: "Angesichts dessen, daß von Themen und dynamischer Entwicklung her Jer 2 eine Einheit bildet, darf diese Vielzahl der Anreden nicht in disparate Schichten aufgelöst werden"; p. 151.

communication structures of address and reference. On the most basic level, 2.1-3.5 has emerged from our discussion as a speech of YHWH to Jerusalem and Judah, the two addressees who are singled out in the commission of the prophet (cf. 1.15-18) and who are explicitly named in 2.2 and 2.28. Alternating movements of one complex address, YHWH speaks to the city (2.1-3, 14-25, 33-37; 3.1-5) and to the people (2.4-13, 26-32). Both are individual entities before him and share and participate in Israel's history of failure and falling to which they are compared throughout the passage. Notable for our study is the relationship between the addressee Judah and the referent Israel in the units 2.4-9 and 2.26-32 which both utilize speech quotations as part of their comparative rhetoric.

The diverse configuration and content of the units, the locations of the quotations, the interconnectedness of the discourse as a whole, and the intricate nature of its communication structures have demonstrated the need for studying each quotation in its unique frame. The textual and structural observations offered in this chapter will form the background for such an exegetical analysis. In order to determine the integration, framing control, and communicative contribution of the twelve insets in 2.1-3.5, we will ask two questions about each individual quotations: 1) What is the inset, that is, what is quoted? 2) How are the insets framed within their literary, rhetorical, and communicative environment? Bearing in mind the tight integration of inset and frame, in some instances it will not be possible to treat these questions in isolation from each other; by the nature of its own definition and dynamics, to talk about a quotation is always to talk about its context and vice versa. Given that each of the five units in our analysis has its own, particular structure, these two questions will be handled in each case according to their distinct parameters, such as the location, number, and interrelationship of the quotations.

## Chapter Four - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.4-13

- 2.4 שְׁמְעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה בֵּית יַעֲקֹב  
וְכָל־מִשְׁפָּחוֹת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל  
2.5 כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה  
מִה־מָצְאוּ אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם בִּי עוֹל  
כִּי רָחֲקוּ מֵעָלַי  
וַיֵּלְכוּ אַחֲרֵי הַהֶבֶל  
וַיִּהְיֶה בָלֹו  
2.6 וְלֹא אָמְרוּ  
אֵיחָהּ יְהוָה  
הַמַּעֲלָה אֶתְנוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם  
הַמּוֹלִיד אֶתְנוּ בַּמִּדְבָּר  
בְּאֶרֶץ עֲרֵבָה וְשׁוּחָה  
בְּאֶרֶץ צִיָּה וְצִלְמוֹת  
בְּאֶרֶץ לֹא־עֹבֵר בָּהּ אִישׁ  
וְלֹא־יֹשֵׁב אָדָם שָׁם  
2.7 וְאָבִיָּא אֶתְכֶם  
אֶל־אֶרֶץ הַפְּרִמָּל  
לֵאכֹל פְּרִיָּהּ וְטוֹבָהּ  
וּתְבֹאוּ וּתְטַמְּאוּ אֶת־אֶרְצִי  
וְנִחַלְתִּי שְׁמִתְּם לְתוֹעֵבָה  
2.8 הַכֹּהֲנִים לֹא אָמְרוּ אֵיחָהּ יְהוָה  
וְתַפְשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה לֹא יִדְעוּנִי  
וְהָרְעִים פָּשְׁעוּ בִּי  
וְהַנְּבִיאִים נִבְּאוּ בַּבַּעַל  
וְאַחֲרָי לֹא־יִזְעֻלוּ הִלְכוּ  
2.9 לָכֵן עַד אָרִיב אֶתְכֶם  
נֹאם־יְהוָה  
וְאֶת־בְּנֵי בְנֵיכֶם  
אָרִיב I will contend!
- Hear the word of YHWH, O House of Jacob,  
and all the clans of the House of Israel:  
Thus says YHWH:  
What injustice did your fathers find in me  
that they went far from me?  
They went after deceptive idols  
and were deceived  
and they did not say:  
“Where is YHWH,  
who brought us up from the land of Egypt,  
who led us through the wilderness,  
through a land of steppe and pit,  
through a land of dryness and deep darkness,  
through a land which nobody crosses  
and where nobody lives?”  
I brought you  
to a fruitful land  
to feast on its fruit and its goodness.  
But you came in and you defiled my land!  
My possession you turned into an abomination!  
The priests did not say: “Where is YHWH?”,  
those who handle Torah did not know me,  
the shepherds transgressed against me,  
the prophets prophesied by Baal,  
and they went after idols which will not benefit.  
Therefore, I still contend with you  
—Speech of YHWH—  
and with the children of your children  
I will contend!

## 1. Introduction

According to our text analysis in the previous chapter, the first instances of quoted speech in 2.1-3.5 are located in 2.4-9 (vv. 6, 8). Including 2.10-13, this unit constitutes YHWH's first address to Judah in the book which condemns the people's abandonment (רחק, v. 5; עזב, v. 13) and their preference for other gods (הלך + אחרים, vv. 5b, 8b; מור + אלהים, v. 11). Despite their deliverance from Egypt and YHWH's gift of the land (vv. 6-7a), Israel's history has been characterized by abominations (תועבה, v. 7b) and allegiance to Baal (v. 8b).

Primarily because of the lexeme ריב in 2.9 and the invocation of nations and cosmos in 2.10-13, this unit has often been assigned to the lawsuit genre.<sup>111</sup> In the last decades, however, this classification has been challenged. De Roche and Daniels go as far as to call for the abandonment of terms like "prophetic lawsuit" or "covenant lawsuit" altogether.<sup>112</sup> Most of the commentators on Jer 2 have since refrained from this categorization. Without eclipsing the accusatory character of YHWH's speech, its structure and nuances are best approached on their own terms rather than through a preconceived form-critical lens.<sup>113</sup>

One of the features that is of special significance for our analysis of the quotations is the unit's trans-political rhetoric. As argued above, YHWH speaks in these verses to the southern kingdom of Judah via the analogy of the unified

---

111. This descriptor goes back to Gunkel (cf. "Schriftsteller," p. xliii) who lists 2.4-9 as one example of prophetic *Gerichtsrede*. See further, e.g., Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* 78 (1959): 287-289; J. Limburg, "The Root ריב and Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* 88 (1969): 291-304; Westermann, *Grundformen*, p. 143. This formal category is still invoked in recent studies, such as Adam Miglio, "Ordeal, Infidelity, and Prophetic Irony in Jeremiah 2.1-9," *SJOT* 24 (2010): 222-234; Miller, p. 598; Wanke, pp. 35-38.

112. Cf. Michael de Roche, "Yahweh's *rîb* against Israel: A Reassessment of the so-called 'Prophetic Lawsuit' in the Preexilic Prophets," *JBL* 102 (1983): 563-574; Dwight R. Daniels, "Is there a 'Prophetic Lawsuit' Genre?," *ZAW* 99 (1987): 339-360. Herrmann (p. 118) likewise sees "zuwenig sichere Anhaltspunkte" for the lawsuit interpretation in 2.4-13; so also Carroll (p. 117) and Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*, pp. 84-85. Note also that Jer 2 does not appear in Kirsten Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge* (JSOTSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1978).

113. See, e.g., Craigie (p. 27), Lundbom (pp. 257-8), Fischer (p. 151). For Brueggemann (p. 32), the lawsuit genre provides the structure, but the poetry of the passage "imbues the conventional form with new power."

nation; he addresses Judah *as* Israel. These comparative dynamics are accompanied by an elaborate communication structure between address and reference which, as we will shortly see, integrates the two quotations in several significant ways. Alongside this scenario, 2.4-9 also evinces trans-temporal dynamics. While YHWH speaks directly to Judah throughout the entire unit, his address also incorporates scenes from the past (v. 5) and extends to the future (v. 9).

The first unit of 2.1-3.5 is thus characterized by an intriguing discourse complexity, presenting YHWH's speech as moving freely, yet orderly, across boundaries of politics and time. If we add to this the material in 2.10-13, we find that YHWH's words also cross over national boundaries, making reference to foreign nations (v. 10) and even calling upon the heavens (v. 12). In view of the unit's communication design and this rhetorical intricacy of trans-political, trans-temporal, and trans-national dynamics, any attempt to analyze the quotations in 2.6 and 2.8 isolated from their framing environment can provide, at best, only a partial picture.

The configuration of the passages thus prompts the question of integration, of quotation-in-context, yet two peculiar characteristics of the insets demand that we also devote our attention to their phrasing and relationship. First, it is only at this point in 2.1-3.5 that we encounter *irrealis* quotations, that is, quotations of unspoken speech (לֹא אָמַרְוּ). Second, only in 2.4-9 appears the same inset (אֵיהָ יְהוָה) on the lips of two different quoted speakers. Due to these notable features, our analysis of the domains of integration, framing control, and communicative contribution will be preceded by a discussion of the insets. This inquiry will be followed by an outline of the structure of 2.4-9 which culminates in an integrated account of how frame and insets relate to one another in this



unit. The analysis ends by probing the connection between our observations regarding the quotations in 2.4-9 and the discourse of 2.10-13.

## 2. The *Irrealis* Insets

Compared with the other quotations in 2.1-3.5, the two insets in 2.6 and 2.8 attract attention by their *irrealis* formulation. In both verses, the *verbum dicendi* אמר is modified by the particle לא, thus marking the quoted words as words in the past which have not been spoken.<sup>114</sup> This kind of quotation occurs in Jeremiah besides 2.4-9 only in 5.24 (לא + אמר), in 8.6 (לא + דבר), and 43.2 (+ לא + שלח), and is rarely found in the rest of the prophets.<sup>115</sup> In view of this limited attestation, the questions of purpose (why are they used?) and location (why do they appear at these specific junctures?) are particularly pressing, especially since the *irrealis* quotations in 2.4-9 are framed as the first quotations in YHWH's opening address to Judah in the book.

Unfortunately, the intriguing insets of 2.6 and 2.8 have been engaged in most studies on prophetic speech quotations only in so far as it concerns the question of authenticity: the text tells us directly that the people did not say these words, therefore, they must be fictitious.<sup>116</sup> To deduce, however, from this observation that they "cannot be regarded as 'real' quotations" is

---

114. Hayes refers to this appropriately as a "non-event"; *The Pragmatics of Perception and Cognition in MT Jeremiah 1.1-6.30: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach* (BZAW 380; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), p. 170.

115. Alongside these four instances, Jeremiah records quoted commands not to speak (אל-תאמר; cf. 1.7) or to lament (לא-יסקדו; cf. 22.18) and six *irrealis* quotations with future orientation (cf. לא + אמר + עוד ["they shall no longer say"], 3.16; 7.32; 16.14; 23.7; 31.29; and לא + עוד ["they shall no longer teach"], 31.34). This formal repetition has led Biddle (cf. *Redaction*, pp. 98-104) and M. Weinfeld to treat them as one distinct corpus; cf. "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," *ZAW* 88 (1976): 2-56. *Irrealis* quotations (לא + אמר) occur in the prophetic literature outside of Jeremiah only five times in Isaiah (33.24; 44.19-20; 45.19; 57.10; see also לא + אמר + עוד in Hos 14.4) and are rare also in other poetic texts; cf. Job 31.31; 35.10; Ps 129.8; Prov 30.15-16.

116. Cf. Wolff, "Zitat," p. 68; Overholt, "Problem," p. 268; Rom-Shiloni, *God*, p. 69. In Meier's study, however, the quotations of 2.6 and 2.8 are listed without differentiation alongside those in 2.20-37; cf. *Speaking*, p. 263.

inappropriate.<sup>117</sup> Like all the other quotations in 2.1-3.5, the two quotations fulfill all the necessary criteria of definition and identification; they possess syntactical and deictic independence, are marked through a *verbum dicendi*, and are unambiguously attributed to their respective quotees. Therefore, the central question is not whether or not they are quotations, but rather how their distinctly negative formulation contributes to their frame. The preoccupation with authenticity and categorical conformity all too often forestalls this kind of analysis.

### 2.1. The Fathers did not say (2.6)

While we already saw that the complexity of 2.4-9 defies an isolated treatment of the quotations, the inset in 2.6 itself demands that we begin our analysis with the clause that precedes it. The need for this procedure is indicated by the conjunctive *waw* which links the *verbum dicendi* (וְלֹא אָמְרוּ) to the series of verbs in 2.5. Moreover, since the question that is set at the head of the unit prompts a subsequent answer, the connection of 2.5-6 cannot be dissolved.<sup>118</sup> After the call to listen in 2.4, YHWH's address opens in 2.5a with this query:

מה־מָצְאוּ אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם בִּי עוֹל      What injustice did your fathers find in me  
כִּי רָחֲקוּ מֵעָלַי      that they went far from me?

Although this question appears to be concerned primarily with Judah's ancestors (רָחֲקוּ/מָצְאוּ), its pronominal deixis also draws attention to YHWH (בִּי/מֵעָלַי). The significance of this juxtaposition between human actions and divine

---

117. Overholt, "Problem," p. 266. Since Overholt shows that *all* quotations in Jer 2 are created, it is not clear what would make, for instance, the insets in 2.20-25 more "real" than those in 2.4-9.

118. According to Overholt, "the rhetorical question of v. 5 dominates the context"; "Problem," p. 267.

character comes to light if the charges of 2.5 are considered more closely. The noun עָוֹל (“injustice”) appears in conjunction with YHWH only twice elsewhere. Both of these passages strictly deny it to be among his attributes and contrast it explicitly with his justice and faithfulness.<sup>119</sup> Similar observations emerge with respect to the fathers’ withdrawal (רָחֵקוּ). Alongside the accusations in Isa 29.13 (וְלִבּוֹ רָחֵק מִמֶּנִּי), Ezek 11.5 and 44.10 (רָחֵקוּ מֵעָלַי), the verb רָחַק occurs in relation to YHWH only in the Psalms where it always articulates the polar opposite of 2.5, namely, a plea towards YHWH *not* to be far (cf. Ps 22.12, 20; 35.22; 38.22; 71.12). Hence, both the ancestors’ distance from YHWH and their apparent attribution of injustice are in marked contrast to what is commonly upheld about YHWH’s character.<sup>120</sup>

This inconceivable nature of the fathers’ actions also underlies the formulation of 2.5a as a rhetorical question: there is, of course, no injustice to be found with YHWH and thus no justification for departing from him.<sup>121</sup> What opens the frame of 2.4-9, then, is the assertion that the behaviour of Judah’s ancestors is absurd and utterly unfounded. The character of Israel’s God is beyond reproach and the only appropriate response is not distance, but devotion.

The fathers’ allegiance to idols (v. 5b) is presented in the discourse progression as the consequence of their unreasonable actions: once they stopped walking after YHWH, they were in need of alternative guidance. In

---

119. Cf. Deut 32.4 (אֵל אֲמוֹנָה וְאֵין עֹל צְדִיק וְיִשָּׁר הוּא) and Job 34.12b (לֹא-יַעֲוֶה מִשְׁפָּט). See also Zeph 3.5: לֹא-יַעֲשֶׂה עֲוֹלָה.

120. Prescott H. Williams: “To accuse or convict Yahweh of ‘*awel*’ is to reverse the affirmations of Israel”; “The Fatal and Foolish Exchange: Living Water for ‘Nothings.’ A Study of Jeremiah 2.4-13.” *ASB* 81 (1965): 18.

121. As Calvin has it, “they were become for no reason apostates”; p. 75. For the exposition of the rhetorical question see further Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*, p. 86. With reference to subsequent accusations directed toward YHWH (cf. 2.35; 3.5), Fretheim has argued that 2.5 poses not a rhetorical but a “real question.” Yet, regardless of whether or not YHWH expects an answer, the impetus of the question remains the same: “It is a mystery even to God why Israel would run after other gods”; p. 64.

correlation to 2.5a, the wordplay around הבל (“deceptive idols/were deceived”) consolidates the foolishness of the fathers’ choices and, by implication, advances the exaltation YHWH as the only reliable God.<sup>122</sup> These incisive charges and the interrogative character of 2.5 call for an explanation: if there is no wrong to be found with YHWH, why did Judah’s ancestors leave him and turn instead to powerless idols? Placed in direct conjunction to this question, the quotation in 2.6 is framed to provide an answer before the discourse moves on to YHWH’s account of land and loathing in 2.7.

In addition to its *irrealis* framing, the inset exhibits another peculiar characteristic. Amounting to a total of twenty-two words, it comprises roughly a third of the combined word count (sixty-five) of the twelve insets in 2.1-3.5. In fact, out of all the quotations in Jeremiah, most of which are restricted to short phrases, this inset stands out as the longest. Across the dialogue that is created between YHWH’s question of only eleven words and the fathers’ extensive rejoinder, this disproportion ascribes a special role to the first quotation in YHWH’s address to his people. To examine what this role may be, both the content and the structure of the inset require close attention. On the most basic level, the quotation divides into three parts:

1. The initial question (אֵיךְ יְהוָה).
2. Two relative clauses about YHWH’s deliverance (הַמַּעֲלָה) and guidance (הַמּוֹלִיד).
3. Three prepositional clauses (בְּאֶרֶץ) which describe the wilderness.

We immediately note a disproportion between the short question and the

---

122. In the religious polemics in Jeremiah, הבל is used to refer to idols/gods (cf. 8.19; 10.8, 15) and, more specifically, to the inability (“vain, worthless”) of these entities to meet the hopes invested in them (cf. McKane: “disillusionment;” p. 31). They are deceptive like the “false” prophets (מְהַבִּלִּים; cf. 23.16) and will not benefit their devotees. The correlation that 2.5 establishes between useless idols and the exaltation of YHWH reappears in 16.19 (יְהוָה עֲזִי וּמַעֲזִי. הַבֵּל וְאִי־יָבִים מוֹעִיל).

lengthy account that is articulated by the subordinate clauses. This imbalance reappears with regard to the content. The expression **אֵיהּ + יְהוָה** occurs only in 2 Kgs 2.14 where it denotes a call for YHWH's supportive intervention.<sup>123</sup> Yet, lending support to Sternberg's remarks about the contextual shaping of verbatim quotations, the twenty words which reiterate YHWH's deeds in the exodus and the wilderness have an entirely different focus: they ask not for help, but explicate and magnify YHWH's faithful actions towards his people. This is expressed in the two confessional (**אֶתְּנֶנּוּ**) relative clauses which take YHWH as their antecedent (**הַמּוֹלִיד/הַמַּעֲלֶה**) as well as in the heightened depiction of the life-threatening wilderness.<sup>124</sup>

Consequently, the emphasis of the inset rests not on the open-ended exclamation "Where is YHWH?" but rather on YHWH's sure support as demonstrated in previous acts of protection.<sup>125</sup> The inset is a credo for YHWH's faithfulness and not a cry for YHWH's help.<sup>126</sup> Arising from its disproportionate

---

123. In this passage, Elisha calls for YHWH's support after Elijah's death. The related construction "**אֵיהּ + אֱלֹהִים**" stands often on the taunting lips of opponents of YHWH and Israel (e.g., 17.15; Joel 2.17; Mal 2.17; Ps 42.4, 11; 79.10; cf. also 2 Kgs 18.34, Isa 36.19, and the variation in Mic 7.10: **אֵיךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ**). In 2.1-3.5, it occurs as a provocative question posed *by* YHWH to his people (cf. 2.28; see analysis below). The idea that **אֵיהּ יְהוָה** denotes a liturgical formula is entertained, e.g., by Volz (p. 18) and Weiser (p. 23) and stands also in the background of Overholt's conclusion that the prophet "made use of stereotyped material to serve his own polemical purpose"; "Problem," p. 268. While Joel S. Burnett thinks that **אֵיהּ יְהוָה** was "recited in the liturgy," his inference from Jdg 6.11-24 and 2 Kgs 2.1-14 is not convincing. The phrase does not appear in the narrative of Gideon's sacrifice and it is far-fetched to detect in either text a "cultic setting" or "gestures of formal worship"; "Changing Gods: An Exposition of Jeremiah 2," *Review and Expositor* 101 (2004): 293.

124. For references to YHWH's deliverance out of Egypt (**עֵלָה**, Hi.), see, e.g., 11.7; 16.14; 23.7. The dangers of the desert are emphasized by the parallel description of its terrain and climate and the double-negation in the final clause (**וְלֹא-יָשָׁב; וְלֹא-עָבַר**); cf. Giesebrecht: "Die Gefahren der Wüste sind hier absichtlich breit aufgezählt, um die göttliche Fürsorge bei Leitung des Volks hervorzuheben"; p. 7.

125. Schmidt sees in 2.6-7 "drei Themen. . . des 'heilsgeschichtlichen Credo'"; p. 73. A similar scenario occurs in the *irrealis* quotation in 5.24 which highlights YHWH's reliability to sustain the seasonal cycle (**הַנִּתְּנִים וְגֶשֶׁם**). Likewise, the *irrealis* quotation in Job 35.10 opens with the question **אֵיהּ אֱלֹהִים עֹשֵׂי** and continues with an explication of the benevolent character of YHWH.

126. As Williams notes, the *verbum dicendi* is **אָמַר**, not **שָׁאֵל**: "The fathers are not being blamed for failing to look for Yahweh, as though he were lost or absent. They are being taken to task for failing to 'say' a question. . . . It is a recital, a confession"; "Exchange," pp. 21-22.

layout, the juxtaposition between interrogative and indicative mood, and the qualification of referent YHWH by the relative clauses, the initial question becomes but a prompter for a substantial affirmation of YHWH's presence, deliverance, and guidance.

Understanding the configuration and outlook of 2.6 in this way has direct implications for its formulation as an *irrealis* quotation. What is said to be missing from the verbal activity of the fathers is not their resolve to "call upon YHWH in their times of special need;"<sup>127</sup> neither is it simply an accusation that they failed to ask for YHWH or that they have forgotten him.<sup>128</sup> Instead, since the unspoken speech is first of all an exaltation of YHWH, the *irrealis* points to a serious lack in the fathers' understanding of YHWH's character. The point of critique, then, is not so much pragmatic (i.e., not asking), but personal. In spite of the foundational significance that the Exodus and the survival in the wilderness have had for the people, YHWH, the author and agent of these events, was no longer known and venerated in accordance with them.<sup>129</sup>

Framed by the question in 2.5, the *irrealis* format of the quotation thus serves to identify the core problem that underlies the fathers' absurd behaviour. Their lack of speaking is a reflection of their lack of knowing YHWH's character which in turn is the reason for their lack of devotion to him. It is precisely because the confession in 2.6 had *not* been uttered that the misconceptions about YHWH can arise and lead to the pursuit of unreliable alternatives.<sup>130</sup> The

---

127. Overholt, "Problem," p. 268.

128. For Hayes, "not-asking is synonymous with forgetting"; *Pragmatics*, p. 173. Yet, in light of the previous statement about the fathers' distance from YHWH and their turn to idols, the failure to ask for YHWH seems to be more intentional. Not asking is not wanting to ask.

129. Cf. Herrmann: "Aber, so will es V. 6, nach diesem Jahwe haben die 'Väter' gerade nicht gefragt"; p. 121. Note also the interpretation by Targum: "And they did not say: 'Let us fear (יִדְרֹא) from before the Lord.'"

130. Cf. Holladay: "What the fathers neglected to say is intertwined with what they did";

argument that is created in the interplay between framing question and responding quotation thus unfolds in reverse order: if the not-spoken words had been spoken, the speakers would have kept alive their knowledge of YHWH, would not have turned away from him, and the mere idea of any shortcomings on his part would have been out of the question. While Overholt is right in saying that the inset expresses “things which should have been said, but weren’t,” the *irrealis* is much more than a rebuke for not calling on YHWH.<sup>131</sup> Integrated within its framing environment, the not-saying of these words epitomizes the not-knowing of the character of YHWH, the deliverer and protector of Israel.

As a complement to this expository and accusatory function of the quotation, the content, structure, and length of the *irrealis* also supports the vindication of YHWH’s character that we saw formulated in the question of 2.5. The acts of redemption and protection that are attributed to his name corroborate the opening assertion that there is no wrong but only good in YHWH.<sup>132</sup> Refuting that there may be some reasonable cause for fathers’ withdrawal, the extensive exaltation in 2.6 mounts an accurate account of who YHWH is and what he has done for his people. In the frame-inset relationship which is constructed across 2.5-6, the negative space of the *irrealis* thus serves as a platform for a positive portrayal of Israel’s God.

---

p. 86. That the failure to speak the confession in 2.6 leads to the pursuit of other gods has already been noted by Rashi (“כי נלך אל אלהים אחרים”; *Miqra’ot*, p. 8) and Weiser (p. 23).

131. “Problem,” p. 267. For the implicit demand to realize the not-realized speech, see also Zahavi-Ely, “Voice”: “The hearers, then, are encouraged to ask precisely what the people within the book are blamed for not asking”; p. 160.

132. So, e.g., Keil: “Die Frage wird durch v. 6 verneint”; p. 39.

## 2.2. The Priests did not say (2.8)

Similar to the case of *irrealis* quotations, the repetition of the same inset within one frame is likewise unique in 2.1-3.5 and rare in the rest of Jeremiah.<sup>133</sup>

Beyond the observation that 2.6 and 2.8 share an identical phrase (אֵיהָ יְהוָה), we must take into account that this phrase is attributed to two different quoted speakers. As discussed above, 2.6 assigns it to the fathers; 2.8 places this expression—again as not-spoken speech—on the lips of the priests (הַכֹּהֲנִים לֹא). This group fronts a list of different types of religious and political leaders, the kind of which occurs frequently in Jeremiah.<sup>134</sup> In addition to the unique reference to the תַּפְּשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה, the list in 2.8 is noteworthy in that it records the only speech quotation in the book which is ascribed exclusively to the priests.<sup>135</sup> In order to examine this special case, the connection with 2.6 and the priests' role within the list of 2.8 present themselves as the logical starting point for our analysis.

Since 2.6 is the longest inset in Jeremiah, the brevity of its parallel in 2.8 is conspicuous. In fact, two-word structures of this kind are the shortest insets attested in 2.1-3.5 and anywhere else in the book (e.g., 2.20; 6.16; 15.2). The proximity of the insets and this marked disproportion suggests that the repetition in 2.8 offers an abbreviated version (*pars pro toto*) of the full inset of

---

133. This phenomenon occurs only in a few places elsewhere in the book (cf. 4.2/5.2; 27.9/27.14; 32.36/32.43/33.10). In addition, the lexeme שְׁלוֹם appears in speech quotations in 4.10, 6.14, 8.11, and 23.17. Double-insets are rare also in the other prophetic books; see, e.g., Isa 36.15, 18; Ezek 13.6-7.

134. See, e.g., 1.18; 2.26; 8.1; 13.13. For the references and roles of the priests in Jeremiah's leader-lists, see Tiemeyer, "The Priests and the Temple Cult in the Book of Jeremiah," in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (BZAW 388; eds. Barstad, Reinhard G. Kratz; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), pp. 233-264.

135. Pace Herrmann (p. 118) and Liwak (*Geschichte*, p. 197) who place the quotation on the lips of the leadership as a whole, possibly because other quotations which reference the priests always include the prophets; cf. 6.13-14; 8.10-11; 23.33-34.



2.6.<sup>136</sup> Hence, the priests are criticized like the fathers not for their failure to call upon YHWH but for their failure to speak about him and thus to know him.<sup>137</sup>

This interpretation, and in retrospect the analysis above, is affirmed by the explicit accusation that the leaders listed in sequence to the priests did not know YHWH (וְתַפְּשִׁי הַתּוֹרָה לֹא יָדְעוּנִי, v. 8aβ).<sup>138</sup> Already Hitzig, Giesebrecht, Duhm, and Cornill understood this group to be synonymous with the priests and this reading has been endorsed recently in Tiemeyer's study.<sup>139</sup> The case for this interpretation is strengthened in addition to her observations by the parallelism of the first two lines of 2.8 and the way in which both are set apart from the other two groups: in contrast to the accusations against the corrupted actions of the shepherds (פִּשְׁעֵנוּ) and prophets (נִבְּאוּ בִּבְעַל), the priests and "those who handle Torah" are reprimanded for their *lack* of action.<sup>140</sup> The charges of not-speaking (לֹא אָמַרְנוּ) and not-knowing (לֹא יָדְעוּנִי) are thus correlated to form a double-statement of priestly defect.

In light of this connection to 2.6 and the internal arrangement of 2.8, the *irrealis* quotation shows that the priesthood displays the same foundational problem that was attributed to the fathers: the lack of speech about YHWH and

---

136. This understanding appears in the exposition of Joseph Kara (cf. *Miqra'ot*, p. 9).

137. For the connection via the quotations, see Herrmann ("V. 8 wirkt wie eine Fortsetzung"; p. 122) and Schmidt (p. 74). This close link may have informed Volz's decision to regard 2.7 as a later addition (p. 13).

138. Such a double negative construction appears also in the *irrealis* quotation in Isa 57.10 which correlates לֹא אָמַרְתָּ with לֹא תָלִית.

139. Tiemeyer points to connections between Torah and priests in Jeremiah and elsewhere (Jer 8.18; Ezek 7.26; Hos 4.6) and the fact that teaching duties are often assigned to priests; cf. "Priests," pp. 242-244; see also her *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage: Post-exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood* (FAT 2te Reihe, 19; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), pp. 115-122. In addition to the scholars mentioned above, see also J. Philip Hyatt who deems the תַּפְּשִׁי הַתּוֹרָה to be "a sub-division of the priesthood" ("Torah in the Book of Jeremiah," *JBL* 60 [1941]: 384-387) and Herrmann (pp. 121-122) who detects in 2.8 the conventional "Drei-Stände-Schema."

140. For the link between speech and knowledge, see Krüger, "Götter": "Hingegen müsste man, um Jahwe folgen zu können, zunächst einmal fragen: 'Wo ist Jahwe?' (vv. 6, 8). Man müsste ihn erkennen bzw. vertrauten Umgang mit ihm pflegen (יָדַע, v. 8)"; p. 184. The closest parallel to the conjoined structure of אָמַר and יָדַע appears in Isa 41.26.

his deeds reveals a lack of accurately knowing him. Across 2.4-9, the interrelationship of the quotations thus asserts that the religious leadership has not learned from the mistakes of the past but follows along the same path.

Beyond this critique of fateful continuity and the failure of generational responsibility (cf. בְּנֵי בְנֵיכֶם, v. 9), the disproportion between full and abbreviated inset also suggests that the priests speak and know *less* than their ancestors. Both speakers are being charged with the same failure, yet the lengthy recital stands on the literary surface of the text in stark contrast to the brief, priestly exclamation. In fact, since both groups are being depicted as having failed to speak anything at all, this disproportion possibly articulates the striking claim that the priests knew *even less than nothing*. Absent from or ignorant of the confessions of their ancestors, the priests, who above all others should know and uphold YHWH's character, have utterly failed in their office of promoting an accurate testimony of their God.

In addition to the combination and contrast between the priests and the other groups that are listed in 2.8, it is also important to consider its final line (וְאַחֲרֵי לֹא-יִזְעָלוּ הָלְכֵנוּ). As Grossberg has argued, this statement is not restricted to the prophets who precede it, but functions as a climactic statement which pertains to the whole leadership and, by virtue of their influence, to the whole nation.<sup>141</sup> Set in motion by the fronted double-statement about the priests, what unfolds in 2.8 is not a random list but rather a successive argumentation with

---

141. Cf. Volz: "Weil die führenden Kreise versagten, war das Resultat, daß 'man' (d. h. das Volk) die ohnmächtigen Abgötter statt Jahwe verehrte"; p. 19 (so also Kimchi, *Miqra'ot*, p. 8). While the placement of the *atnaḥ* supports Fischer's decision to restrict the line to the prophets (p. 160), the sequence of four waw-conjunctives unifies the leaders. As Daniel Grossberg has pointed out, the only difference across these uniform lines is the imperf. verbal form in the final line; cf. "Noun/Verb Parallelism: Syntactic or Asyntactic," *JBL* 99 (1980): 486-487. For further arguments for this reading, see Watson (*Poetry*, pp. 157-158), Williams ("Exchange," p. 32), and Holladay who draws attention to the echoes between the last line of 2.8 and those of 2.5 and 13 which are both corporate summary statements (*Architecture*, pp. 37-38).

teleological orientation. Given the emphasis on the priestly not-speaking and not-knowing at the beginning of the verse, this trajectory highlights that their failure is responsible for the royal transgressions, the prophetic invocation of Baal, and for the waywardness of the people as a whole.<sup>142</sup> As in the case of the ancestors, the framing of the inset correlates the absence of right speech with the absence of right behaviour. The failure to speak, know, and confess YHWH is again identified as the core problem and prompts the people's lack of devotion to him which in turn leads to their pursuit of useless alternatives (cf. הלך + אחרי, vv. 5b, 8b).<sup>143</sup>

The specific attribution of the quotation to the priests and this charge against choosing “idols that will not benefit” echoes the rhetoric of 2.5-6. The *irrealis* inset in 2.8 emphasizes that not YHWH but the religious leadership is to be blamed for the disposition of his people. There is no wrong and no injustice to be found in him; rather, his good deeds were no longer part of the priestly proclamation and hence lacking in the political, prophetic, and popular orientation. As with the fathers' turn to deceptive idols, this collective failure culminates in the absurd preference for unreliable substitutes. If the priests had known YHWH according to his faithfulness and redemptive acts and if the leaders and people had heard and heeded their testimony, they would have come to see that it is not these entities (לֹא-יִזְעִלוּ) but YHWH alone who can benefit them.<sup>144</sup>

---

142. Cf. Tiemeyer, “Priests”: “[The priests] are again not faulted for their cultic activities, but are instead charged with having failed in their teaching duty towards the people”; p. 243.

143. With reference to the prophetic misconduct in 2.8, see Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*: “‘Baal’ ist für Jeremia Personifikation jeder Art von hybrider Selbstüberhebung und Jahwevergessenheit, die Jahwe als den einzigen Retter und Helfer beiseiteschiebt zugunsten selbstgemachter brüchiger Sicherheiten”; p. 73. Allen (p. 41) and Carroll (p. 125) draw attention to the polemic play with roots, reminiscent of הבל in 2.5b, between בעל and יעל. C. W. Eduard Nägelsbach suspects “an allusion to בַּלְיַעַל”; *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Theologically and Homiletically Expounded* (translated by Samuel R. Asbury; New York: Scribner's Sons, 1886), p. 32.

144. Similar to הבל in 2.5b, יעל denotes an effort or hope which will be frustrated (e.g.,

### 3. Frame and Insets in 2.4-9

Though our discussion was first directed to the peculiar *irrealis* formulation and the interrelationship of the quoted insets, we see that both of these aspects cannot be grasped in an analysis that casts aside the frame that surrounds them. Whether regarding to the question in 2.5 or the internal structure of 2.8, both insets are inseparably tied to their immediate environment and can only be understood in relation to it. The question of integration was thus treated in some respects, yet it remains to consider how the discourse of 2.4-9 as a whole frames the two insets, especially with regard to its communication structure and the trans-political and trans-temporal dynamics indicated above. Only once we have closely attended to these characteristics of the unit can we determine how and to what end the two quotations function in the frame of 2.4-9 and in relationship to 2.10-13.

#### 3.1. Structure, Address, and Reference

Considering the respective positions of the quoted insets, an inquiry of their integration leads first to the question of the basic structure of the unit.

According to Lundbom's rhetorical work, the material in 2.5-9 revolves around a "chiasmus of speaker" which consists of the outer parallel between fathers and children in 2.5 and 2.9 (A/A'), the inner parallel of the quotations in 2.6 and 2.8 (B/B'), and the central assertion in 2.7 (C).<sup>145</sup>

---

7.8; 1 Sam 12.21; Isa 30.5. Rudolph translates 2.8 appropriately as "Nichtsnutze"; p. 12). The lexemes יעל and הבל occur in combination also in 16.19 (in 1 Sam 12.21 and Isa 44.9, יעל appears with תהו). In Job, יעל occurs only in pessimistic, rhetorical questions (e.g., 21.15: מִה־נוֹעֵל; cf. 30.13; 35.3). The only positive use of יעל in the HB appears in Isa 48.17 with reference to YHWH (אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִלְמֶדֶךָ לְהוֹעִיל).

145. Cf. *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (SBLDS 18; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 71-74, and also his commentary (p. 257). Craigie (p. 27) likewise detects a chiasm in 2.5b-8 centred around the quoted speeches (הלך אחרי, A/A'; איה יהוה, B/B').

While this outline helpfully highlights the deliberate arrangement of the unit and the integration of the two quotations within it, some of Lundbom's conclusions are tied too closely to his chiastic construction. Besides the unwarranted textual reorganization which his proposal requires and the questionable claim that 2.7 marks the unit's turning point,<sup>146</sup> the most problematic aspect is Lundbom's assertion that the quoted speakers of the B/B' parallel are identical. We already saw that the insets are specifically attributed to different entities, viz. fathers and priests, moreover this interpretation clashes with the communication structure and the trans-temporal dynamics which define 2.4-9. In order to focus on these characteristics more explicitly, we trace here the interrelationship between addressee and referent as it unfolds across the unit:

vv.	addressee	referent	quoted referent	markers
4	Judah			שָׁמְעוּ
5aα	Judah	fathers		אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם מִה־מִצָּאָו
5aβ-b		fathers		רָחֳקוּ / וַיֵּלְכוּ / וַיִּהְיֶיבְלוּ
6aα		fathers		וְלֹא אָמְרוּ
6aβ-b			fathers	
7	Judah			אֲתָכֶם / וַתִּבְאוּ / וַתִּטְמְאוּ / שָׁמָּה
8aα1		priests		לֹא אָמְרוּ
8aα2			priests	
8aβ-b		leaders		לֹא יָדְעוּנִי / פָּשְׁעוּ / נִבְּאוּ / הָלְכוּ
9	Judah			אֲתָכֶם / בְּנֵיכֶם

The discourse is dominated by YHWH's 2mp-address from the appeal and

---

146. Lundbom deletes 2.6c and reads 2.8bβ with 2.9 to match it with 2.5 in his A/A' parallel; cf. *Rhetoric*, pp. 72-73. This reading, however, breaks the chain of waw-conjunctives in 2.8 (וַאֲחֵרִי) and undermines the momentum of beginning 2.9 with the conclusive conjunction לָכֵן to which Lundbom himself draws attention. As argued below, 2.7 marks not the turning point but rather the medial element in the temporal sequence from past (v. 5) to future (v. 9).

question in 2.4-5 to the conclusion in 2.9.<sup>147</sup> However, it is interspersed with two referential sections in which he talks about the ancestors (vv. 5-6) and about the leadership (v. 8). Since the two quotations occur in these third-person portions, it is necessary to attend more closely to the communication structure of address and reference as it unfolds along the progression of 2.4-9. The observations from our preceding discussion of the insets are integrated in passing throughout this reading; a full portrayal of their contribution follows immediately after it.

The two discourse dimensions of speaking *to* and speaking *about* are intertwined immediately in 2.5: YHWH talks about the fathers—all verbs are 3mp—yet he does this in his address to the people of Judah who are thereby explicitly linked to the nation’s historical heritage (“*your fathers*”).<sup>148</sup> From the connection which we have determined for 2.5-6, it follows that YHWH not only rehearses the distance and idol veneration of the fathers before Judah’s ears but also that the *irrealis* quotation is directed to them. In this interplay of address and reference, YHWH presents to the Judahites the lack of speech, confession, and knowledge that characterized them as a people in the distant past. Contrary to the interpretation advanced by Biddle, Schmidt, and Liwak, the first two verses are thus not directed to the fathers, nor, as Holladay thinks, do they talk about infractions committed by the current generation.<sup>149</sup> As in 2.1-3, YHWH talks to one party (Judah) about another (Israel’s ancestors) and his address

---

147. This is indicated by the imperative that opens 2.4-9 (שְׁמַעוּ) and the suffixes (אַבוֹתֵיכֶם, v. 5), pronouns (אַתֶּם, vv. 7, 9), and verbs (שָׁמַעְתֶּם; וְהִטַּמְאִו וְהִטְבְּאוּ, v. 7) throughout.

148. For Hayes, the rhetorical question in 2.5 “anchors the term *fathers* to the present addresses by the m/p suffix attached to the noun”; *Pragmatics*, pp. 168-169 (emphasis original).

149. Biddle is convinced that “the remainder [i.e., excluding 2.1-3] of Jeremiah 2 is to be understood as an address to the fathers. . . . Yahweh is speaking throughout to the fathers!”; *Redaction*, pp. 36-37 (see further pp. 128, 131-132). Schmidt (p. 67) understands the section as a “Frage an Väter (V. 5) und Israel (V. 6).” See also Liwak, *Geschichte*, pp. 155-156. In Holladay’s view, 2.5-8 are “a description of Israel’s present situation”; *Architecture*, p. 36.

draws from the full scope of the nation's history.

This interwoven structure continues in 2.7-9. In succession to the address in 2.4, the pronoun **אַתֶּכֶם** and the three 2mp-verbs in 2.7 direct YHWH's words to the people of Judah. His discourse so far has centered on their fathers' wrongdoing, but now they themselves are being reproved for their behaviour. Following the inset's account of exodus and wilderness, 2.7 speaks to the current generation of Judah as the generation who first entered the land (**וְאַבְיָא אֶל-אַרְץ**). Evidently, this cannot be meant on a historical level.<sup>150</sup> Rather, by virtue of the shared national heritage and by means of the sudden switch from the third-person narration in 2.5-6 to the direct address in 2.7, YHWH's speech connects the current Judahites to the past.<sup>151</sup>

While this rhetorical manoeuvre serves an obvious confrontational purpose, it functions primarily to set Judah in continuity with the infractions of their ancestors.<sup>152</sup> At the same time, it highlights the disproportion between YHWH's good character and the people's bad conduct: similar to 2.5-6, divine guidance (**וְאַבְיָא אֶתְכֶם**) and gifts (**פְּרִיָה וְטוֹבָה; אֶרְצִי וְנַחֲלָתִי**) are starkly juxtaposed with human transgression (**וְתַטְמְאוּ; שְׁמָתֶם לְתוֹעֵבָה**).<sup>153</sup> There is, then, a clear distinction in the text between past Israel (the fathers) and current Israel (the

---

150. Regardless which date one assigns to the conquest, it is impossible to understand the current addressee Judah as the generation associated with it. Rather, as Holladay states, "the hearers are *still* the recipients of the land"; p. 87 (emphasis added). Williams understands the conquest in 2.7 as "the act in which 'you' (the original hearers?) participated, you who are your fathers' sons"; "Exchange," p. 25.

151. In Fretheim's understanding, the switch in 2.7 "collapses the distinction between the ancestors and the present readers"; p. 65.

152. McKane (p. 31) appropriately speaks here of an "indivisibility of responsibility."

153. While the combination of **טוב + פרי + אכל** recalls the garden narrative in Gen 3.6 and Israel's first encounter with the bountiful land (Deut 1.25), it occurs in the exact form of 2.7 only in the confession of Israel's ungrateful exploitation of YHWH's land in Neh 9.36. In correlation to 2.5b, **תועבה** is related in Jeremiah primarily to the worship of other gods/idols (cf. 7.9; 16.18; 32.25; 44.4, 22; see also 6.15/8.12 and Deut 7.26; 12.31; 13.14-15; 17.3; 27.15; 32.16). If Jacob Milgrom is correct that Lev 18.24-30 (cf. **טמא + ארץ**) refers to pollution not in a cultic but in moral sense ("sexual violations"), 2.7 articulates a twofold charge related to illicit worship and illicit social life; *Leviticus 17-22* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), pp. 1572-1573.

addressee Judah); however, both entities exhibit the same absurd behaviour in response to YHWH's goodwill.

This rhetoric of trans-temporal continuity and the communication structures that attend it inform our understanding of 2.8. YHWH speaks as in 2.5-6 *to the people of Judah about* someone else, namely, the priests,<sup>154</sup> and quotes this referent in their hearing. They thus witness the verbal failure of their religious leaders and its fateful consequences for their society. While this confrontation exposes the internal collapse of Judah, it also provides justification for YHWH's stark announcement in 2.9, the *telos* of the unit. It is at this point that the quick progression of fathers, Egypt, wilderness, conquest, and leadership, reaches its conclusion (לָכֵן): in view of the current state of his people, YHWH will not stop to engage them but continue the ongoing dispute (עַד אֲרִיב). To complete the trans-temporal dynamics of the unit, but also to emphasize the unchanging nature of Israel's apostasy, this announcement even includes those people who are, presumably, not yet born (וְאַת־בְּנֵי בְנֵיכֶם אֲרִיב). The current generation of Judahites is the target of YHWH's address throughout the entire unit, yet the rhetorical perspective which it constructs frames their failure in relation to past (vv. 5-6), contemporary (vv. 7-8), and future (v. 9) scenarios.<sup>155</sup>

By examining the structure, communication design, and rhetoric of 2.4-9, it becomes evident that the unit is not organized along a chiasmic structure but rather as a progression which runs from question to conclusion and from past to future. The main purpose of this arrangement is to express the continuation of

---

154. Pace Lundbom, *Rhetoric*: "[Verse 8] identifies the fathers"; p. 73.

155. Biddle is correct to speak of "a pan-temporal indictment of Israel's entire history" (*Redaction*, p. 132), yet there is little support for his claim that 2.4-9 reflects a "pan-Israel addressee tradition" which aims to condemn all generations of Israel at all times; so, e.g., also R. E. Clements, *Jeremiah* (IBC; Atlanta, GA: WJK, 1988), p. 22. As demonstrated in our analysis of the communication structures, the trans-temporal indictment of this unit is direct specifically to Judah.



Israel's failure to behave in accordance with YHWH's guidance, gifts, and goodness. What began with the absurd withdrawal of the nation's fathers and the subsequent defilement of YHWH's land, manifests itself currently in the utter disregard for YHWH by the leaders and people of Judah and is anticipated to continue in future generations. In contrast to previous studies, our analysis has advanced a reading that takes seriously the indicators for the communication structures of this passage and as a result depicts its full complexity of addressed, referential, and quoted speech. Having thus established the framing environment of the two insets, it remains for us to briefly discuss their role within the quick shifts and trajectories that dominate 2.4-9.

### **3.2. The Contribution of the Insets**

Due to their placement between the three time periods that unfold across this unit, the quotations in 2.6 and 2.8 inevitably stand in the service of its communicative agenda. This is expressed chiefly by the repetition of the phrase **אֵיהָ יְהוָה** which links the former generation to the present one and also by the foolish preference for useless gods which attends the verbal failure of fathers and leaders alike. YHWH's current accusations are thereby grounded in a long-standing history of lacking speech, knowledge, and behaviour. Moreover, the relative disproportion of the insets may indicate a decreasing knowledge of YHWH's character.

This movement from no speech to less than no speech stands side by side with the increased confrontation that YHWH's speech describes. From the challenge in 2.5 to the direct charge in 2.7 and the declaration of continual strife in 2.9, the severity of YHWH's address rises continually. The discourse of 2.4-9 thus constructs a scenario of counter-communication: the more Judah's God labours to recall his actions, gifts, and care for his people, the less they speak

about him, the less they know him, and the less they act in accordance with his character. In spite of increased divine initiative, Judah's understanding and response to YHWH is even more deviant than that of their wayward ancestors.

The analysis of address and reference reveals yet another way in which 2.4-9 frames the two quotations. As shown in throughout our discussion, one of the vital aspects of the unit is YHWH's strategy of talking to Judah about other entities, namely, the fathers and priests. Whereas both 2.5-6 and 2.8 are descriptions about these entities—amassing a total of ten 3mp-verbs—the insets provide, with their verbal demonstrations, a different form of communication and create other voices alongside that of YHWH. Through this simulated, multi-vocal discourse of God, founding fathers, and religious leaders, Judah is exposed to an authoritative “ear-witness” demonstration of the not-speaking and not-knowing that marks them as a people. The quotations make the discourse vivid and personal, but also confrontational: the multiplication of voices which manifest Israel's failures condemns the listening addressees by what they have spoken, or rather, by what they have failed to speak. As the divine accusations centre largely on deficient devotion and behaviour, the formulation of the quotations as *irrealis*, as absent speech, is particularly well-suited towards this end. The dynamics of question and quotation in 2.5-6 and the double-statement of priestly defect in 2.8a show that YHWH's people, both in the past and in Judah's contemporary society, have failed him in deed and in word. Whether they act or speak, they can only disappoint his expectations.

Alongside their contribution to YHWH's accusations and comparisons, the insets are also framed to vindicate YHWH's character. The exaltation of his deliverance in 2.6 and the linking of Judah's apostasy to the failure of their religious leaders entirely serve the frame. In addition to the fronted acclaim of

YHWH in 2.5-6, he is elevated especially in the portrayal as gracious giver in 2.7. Likewise, the initial approach in 2.4-5, the positive self-references in 2.7, and the commitment to further conversation in 2.9 all serve to present YHWH as deeply invested in his people. Contrary to what one might expect in response to this material and communicative goodwill, the *irrealis* quotations show that his people have failed to give an appropriate answer. By virtue of the attributed depiction of Israel's communicative and confessional failure, the quotes' correlation of lacking right words with lacking right deeds, and the positive portrayal of the extended inset in 2.6, the speech quotations in 2.4-9 corroborate the assertion that heads the frame: there is no wrong in YHWH.

#### 4. The Context of 2.10-13

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 2.10 | כִּי עָבְרוּ אֵי כִּתִּיִּים וְרָאוּ<br>וּמָדַר שְׁלָחוּ<br>וְהִתְבּוֹנְנוּ מְאֹד<br>וְרָאוּ הֵן הִיְתָה כְּזֹאת  | For cross over to the coastlands of Kittim and see!<br>Send to Kedar<br>and examine with care!<br>See whether such a thing has happened:   |
| 2.11 | הֲהִימִיר גּוֹי אֱלֹהִים<br>וְהֵמָּה לֹא אֱלֹהִים<br>וְעַמִּי הִמִּיר כְּבוֹדוֹ<br>בְּלֹא יוֹעִיל   | Has any nation ever changed gods?<br>And those are not even gods!<br>But my people have exchanged their glory<br>for that which will not benefit.  |
| 2.12 | שָׁמוּ שָׁמַיִם עַל־זֹאת<br>וְשָׁעְרוּ חָרְבוּ מְאֹד<br>נֹאֵם־יְהוָה  | Be appalled at this, O heavens,<br>be shocked and utterly desolate!<br>—Speech of YHWH—  |
| 2.13 | כִּי־שְׁתִּים רָעוֹת עָשָׂה עַמִּי<br>אֶתִּי עָזְבוּ<br>מְקוֹר מַיִם חַיִּים<br>לְחַצֵּב לָהֶם בְּאֵרוֹת<br>בְּאֵרֹת נִשְׁבְּרִים<br>לֹא־יִכְלוּ הַמַּיִם | For my people have committed two evils:<br>me they have forsaken,<br>the fountain of living waters,<br>thus digging wells for themselves,<br>wells which are about to break,<br>which will not hold their water. |

According to the discussion of the structure of 2.1-3.5 in the previous chapter, the frame for our analysis of 2.6 and 2.8 was restricted to 2.4-9. Nevertheless,

we also noted that this unit exhibits direct links to 2.10-13.<sup>156</sup> Hence, before bringing this chapter to its conclusion, it remains to examine how our observations of 2.4-9 may relate to the latter part of the larger unit of 2.4-13.

As an appropriate sequel to the trans-political and trans-temporal dynamics in 2.4-9, the discourse now cuts across national boundaries. In 2.10, YHWH's unspecified addressees are called to turn their eyes to the far west (אַיִי (בְּתַיִים) and the far east (קֶדָר).<sup>157</sup> The conjunction כי which begins this verse connects the strong appeal of five imperatives to the preceding material, thus suggesting that 2.10-13 may provide the justification for YHWH's striking announcement in 2.9.<sup>158</sup> Yet, the loaded rhetorical question (הֲהִימִיר גּוֹי אֱלֹהִים) and its adjacent charge (וְעַמִּי הִמִּיר) in 2.11 introduce nothing new but harken back to the charge of 2.5. The inexplicable exchange of YHWH for other entities who are not gods (וְהִמָּה לֹא אֱלֹהִים) echoes the fathers' absurd turn to unreliable gods (cf. הַבַּל in v. 5b).<sup>159</sup>

---

156. In addition to the conjunction כי in 2.10, see also יַעַל + לֹא (vv. 8, 11). Holladay perceives a link between 2.5 and 8 (חֹלֶךְ + אַחֲרֵי) and 2.13 (אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יָכְלוּ הַמָּיִם); cf. *Architecture*, pp. 37-38.

157. For the geography of Kedar and Kittim, see, e.g., Herrmann, p. 124. While some exegetes think that 2.10-13 is addressed to Israel (e.g., McKane, p. 34; Weiser, p. 23; cf. vocative בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל in Targum), the new address that is indicated by the five imperatives in 2.10 and YHWH's referential speech about "my people" (vv. 11, 13) makes this unlikely. While the heavens are addressed by YHWH elsewhere (e.g., 6.19; 22.29; Isa 1.2; Mic 1.2), they are nonsensical as the recipients of 2.10 (cf. Holladay: "It is grotesque to visualize the heavens crossing to Cyprus"; p. 90). The suggestion made by Lundbom (p. 266) and, with variation, by Liwak (cf. *Geschichte*, pp. 197-198) that 2.10-13 employs apostrophe, i.e., a rhetorical address to an unspecific audience, fits the context of the national and cosmic expansion much better (cf. Wanke: "Ein universales Forum"; p. 37). According to Volz, 2.10-13 depicts a discourse in which "Jahwe sein Volk nicht anredet und sich gleichsam gekränkt und traurig von ihm zurückzieht, um mit anderen über 'sein Volk' zu sprechen, das ihn so tief verwundet hat (zweimaliges עָמִי in 11 u. 13)"; p. 22.

158. *Pace* Holladay (p. 90) who argues that כי in 2.10 should not be translated as "for" because "what follows is not in any sense a reason for what has preceded." His asseverative translation ("Look!") is possible but occurs more often in oaths or conditional clauses (cf. JM §164b). As Craigie has rightly observed, 2.9 "links the following charges to the preceding sins"; p. 27

159. Cf. Schmidt, *Propheten*: "Etwas ganz unbegreifliches"; p. 219. The phrase לֹא אֱלֹהִים appears only ten times, half of which are descriptors for idols (2 Kgs 19.18; Isa 37.19; Jer 16.20;

The discourse of 2.10-11 thus affirms the assertions of 2.5-6, namely, that YHWH's people act in nonsensical ways which are entirely unrelated to his character. The broadened stage of the trans-national, comparative perspective identifies this behaviour as internationally unprecedented.<sup>160</sup> While the fathers' instigation of injustice and their withdrawal were contrary to Israel's confessions, the exchange of gods remains unparalleled, thus increasing both the guilt of Israel and the guiltlessness of YHWH.

After expanding the parameters of YHWH's speech yet another level from nations to cosmos (שְׁמוֹ שָׁמַיִם, v. 12), this agenda also underlies the conclusion in 2.13. Complementing YHWH's denigration of the other deities in 2.11, the aquatic imagery asserts his incomparability.<sup>161</sup> Due to the noteworthy fronted "me" (אֲנִי עֶזְבִּי) and the contrast between YHWH as the "fountain of living waters" and the idols as "broken wells,"<sup>162</sup> the final statement of 2.4-13 is not a divine charge but a defence of divine character: the focus lies not on the *forsaking* of YHWH, but on the forsaking of *YHWH*. In light of the account of his deeds in 2.6-7, his communicational investment throughout Israel's history, and

---

Hos 8.6; 2 Chr 13.19).

160. The combination of מִוֶּרֶד (Hi.) + אֱלֹהִים is unique. Cf. Schmidt: "Das Wortpaar greift räumlich (v. 10) oder gar kosmisch (v. 12) weit über Israel hinaus, bezieht die Ferne ein, um die Einmaligkeit des Vorgangs herauszustellen;" "'Geht doch und schaut!' Aufrufe, sich selbst zu überzeugen, im Jeremiabuch," in *Gottes Recht als Lebensraum* (FS Hans J. Boecker; eds. Peter Mommer, Schmidt, and Hans Strauß; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993), p. 228.

161. There is no justification for imposing upon the water imagery a marital interpretation as advanced, for instance, by Brueggemann ("The metaphor is water, but behind it lies the metaphor of marriage"; p. 37) and de Roche who draws questionable parallels to the water imagery in Prov 5.15-18 and Song of Songs 4.12-15; cf. "Israel's 'Two Evils' in Jeremiah 2.13," *VT* 31 (1981): 369-371. As noted by Daniel Bourguet, the divine epithet of fountain or source is common in the ANE; cf. *Des Métaphores de Jérémie* (Paris: Gabala, 1987), p. 432.

162. This particular construction of the object אֲנִי preceding the verb appears in three other passages in Jer 4-6 which all focus explicitly on YHWH's character (cf. 4.17, 22; 5.22). Only few interpreters note this special syntactical feature in 2.13; see, e.g., Holladay (p. 92); Stulman (p. 49); Holt "The Foundation of Living Water and the Deceitful Brook: The Pool of Water Metaphors in the Book of Jeremiah (MT)," in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (BETL 187; ed. Pierre van Hecke; Leuven: University Press, 2005), p. 101. The contrast is further heightened by the fact that cisterns are more difficult to maintain and prone to poor water quality; cf. "Cisterns," in *DBI*, pp. 149-150.

his superiority over all other claims to divinity, the withdrawal of his people simply cannot be related to his character. The absurdity that is reflected by the preference for inferior deities and the lamenting tone of 2.13 thus point to a deep-rooted failure of the people to know YHWH as the supreme God, as the only fountain of life.

Connecting these observations with our analysis of 2.4-9, the framing of the quoted speeches in 2.6 and 2.8 presents itself as an apt preparation for these verses. The positive portrayal of YHWH in the inset of 2.6 anticipates and counteracts any doubts regarding his character that may arise through his people's exchange. Before the other nations which may witness Israel's departure from him, YHWH is vindicated by his initiative and reliability. Conversely, expanding the comparison beyond Israel's national boundaries and highlighting the unparalleled foolishness of their choices justifies the accusation that is articulated in 2.4-9. Alongside this contribution to YHWH's vindication, the way in which the two quotations are framed foreshadows the root problem which underlies the inexplicable exchange of YHWH for inferior entities. Because his people did not speak about him as they should have, they failed to know him as their redeemer and provider. This process inevitably led to their attachment to other sources of sustenance (לְחֵצֵב) which in the long run would break and leave them empty.<sup>163</sup>

---

163. Duhm (p. 21) and Lundbom (p. 267) think that the "two evils" in 2.13 (שְׁתֵּי רָעוֹת) are actually one. Yet, if the inf. cons. לְחֵצֵב is read as a result clause (cf. WOC §36.2.3d; *WHS* §198; Herrmann: "Das eine bedingt das andere"; p. 127), the people's abandonment of YHWH (evil no. 1) is both distinguished from *and* correlated to their turn to other sources (evil no. 2). So already Calvin (pp. 93) and A. W. Streane [*The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah together with the Lamentations* (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1892), p. 16) and more recently, Holt, "Fountain," p. 101. For the polemic ambiguity of לָחֵץ as a reflexive (ethical) dative and/or a dative of disadvantage, see Holladay (p. 92; cf. *WHS* §271b-272).

## 5. Conclusion

We began our analysis of the two speech quotations in 2.4-13 by noting three areas which needed to be addressed, namely, the *irrealis* formulation, the assignment of the same inset to different quotees, and the integration of the quotes within their complex frame of communication and rhetoric. With regard to the insets, we have come to see that the peculiar negative phrasing deserves more attention than previously granted. A categorical disregard along the lines of “authentic vs. fabricated” preempts any further exploration of their usage and obfuscates their contribution to the composition. If considered on their own terms and for their own sake, both quotations have confirmed Sternberg’s argument that form and function must not be correlated along fixed contours. Far from simply stating that something has not been said, the quoted question in 2.6 has revealed itself not to be a cry for help but an exaltation of YHWH’s character. Framed by the question in 2.5, the not-spoken speech serves to identify the root problem that underlies the fathers’ withdrawal from YHWH whilst at the same time vindicating him as being beyond reproach. Likewise, the quotation in 2.8 is not merely an accusation against absent words but connects past and current generations and indicates that Judah’s religious leaders knew even less of YHWH than their ancestors.

The various contributions of the quotations have come into view with more detail as we examined their integration within the fusion of 2.5-6 and among the three temporal phases and the 3rd-person material. Being inseparably bound to their environment, the quotations are subsumed under its communicative goals: they are framed in order to exalt YHWH (cf. vv. 5-7, 13), to depict Israel’s behaviour as utterly absurd and unfounded (cf. הַבֵּל, v. 5; לֹא יַעַל, vv. 8b, 11; לֹא כֹל, v. 13b), and to demonstrate that Judah’s failure to speak and know about YHWH goes far beyond the failure of their wayward ancestors. The juxtaposition between YHWH’s verbal efforts and the decrease in speech

portions from 2.6 and 2.8 further indicates a breakdown of communication. This depiction is accentuated by the combination of Judah's quoted, demonstrative omission and YHWH's record of descriptive neglect. His people are thus depicted as having failed to respond appropriately in both word and deed. Moreover, in the interplay of address and reference, the speech quotations confront Judah with a vivid multi-vocal manifestation of their past and present shortcomings.

The indirections and control of framing, the demonstrative capacity, and the diversification of speaking voices are all unique properties of quoted speech. Since the impact and involvement of the discourse would thus be weakened by their absence, it is important to recognize the particular contributions that they make. Our first analysis thus promotes the case for the contextually sensitive reading of speech quotations. Against the devaluation of "fictitious" quotations and well beyond the strictures of rigid antithesis, prophetic speech quotation functions however it suits and supports the communicative design of its frame.

In the case of 2.4-9, this design centres on YHWH's accusation and vindication. The two insets justify his charges by way of verbal confirmation, they create and exceed continuity by way of verbal linkage, and they confront Judah directly by way of verbal demonstration. Complementing these accusatory functions, the positive portrayal which is placed in the negative space of the *irrealis* inset in 2.6 exalts him as redeemer and protector, and all of these characteristics ultimately corroborate the assertion that opens and ends 2.4-13: there is no wrong in YHWH, he is the only source of life. In the interplay of this vindication and the depiction of Israel's absurd pursuit of useless idols and broken wells, the quotations serve to articulate the root problem of YHWH's people. The failure to speak about him has led to the failure of knowing him and



following after him. The absence of testimony has led to transgression, the lack of words to a lack of worship.

This rhetoric of YHWH's faultlessness and Judah's deep-seated failure provides an important basis not only for YHWH's vindication before the nations in 2.10-13, but also for the remainder of 2.1-3.5, that is, his first address to Judah and Jerusalem in the book. This foundational significance of the discourse and quotations of 2.4-13 will come to light immediately as we turn our attention in the next chapter to the comparative argumentation of YHWH's address to Jerusalem in 2.14-25.

## Chapter Five - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.14-25

### 1. Introduction

Reversing the flow of our analysis of 2.4-9 and 2.10-13, our next unit places a considerable portion of discourse *before* the frame of the quoted insets. We saw in our text analysis in chapter three that 2.20-25 and its three quotations are connected to 2.14-19 in several ways, the כִּי-conjunction in 2.20a being the most apparent. Since the first frame-inset relationship already appears in this opening verse, the analysis of this quotation and also of those in 2.23-25 cannot proceed without a brief examination of the perspectives and questions that are constructed in YHWH's address in 2.14-19.

### 2. The Context of 2.14-19

2.14	הַעֲבַד יִשְׂרָאֵל	Was Israel a bondsman?
	אִם־יָלִיד בֵּית הוּא	Or was he even a home-born slave?
	מִדּוּעַ הָיָה לְבֹז	Why has he become spoil?
2.15	עָלְיוּ יִשְׂאֲגוּ כְּפָרִים	The young lions have roared against him,
	נָתְנוּ קוֹלָם	they have lifted their voice.
	וַיִּשְׁתּוּ אֶרְצוֹ לְשָׂמָה עָרָיו	They have turned his land into a waste,
	נָצְתוּ מִבְּלִי יֹשֵׁב	his cities were burnt, left without inhabitants.
2.16	גַּם־בְּנֵי־נֹף וְתַחֲפָנֶחֱס	Likewise, the sons of Noph and Tahpanhes
	יִרְעוּךָ קִדְקֹד	will smash your skull!
2.17	הֲלוֹא־זֹאת תַּעֲשֶׂה־לָּךְ	Is it not this that will do this to you,
	עֲזֹבֶךָ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	that you forsake YHWH, your God,
	בְּעֵת מוֹלִידְךָ בְּדֶרֶךְ	at a time when he leads you in the way?
2.18	וְעַתָּה מַה־לָּךְ	Therefore, for what reason do you seek
	לְדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם	the way of Egypt
	לְשִׁתּוֹת מִי שַׁחֲוֹר	to drink the waters of the Nile?
	וּמַה־לָּךְ	And for what reason do you seek
	לְדֶרֶךְ אַשּׁוּר	the way of Assyria
	לְשִׁתּוֹת מִי נָהָר	to drink the waters of the Euphrates?

2.19                      תִּסְרֹךְ רָעָתְךָ    Your evil will discipline you  
                               וּמִשְׁבוּתֶיךָ תּוֹכַחֲךָ    and your apostasies will reprove you!  
                               וְדָעִי וּרְאִי            Then you will know and see  
                               כִּי־רָע וְקָמָר            how evil and bitter it is  
                               עֲזַבְךָ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ    that you forsake YHWH, your God,  
                               וְלֹא פָחַדְתִּי אֵלַיִךְ        and that you do not fear me.  
                               נֹאֵם־אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת    —Speech of Lord YHWH Zebaoth—

As previously in 2.1-3 and 2.4-13—and directly continuing from 2.10-13 (עמי)—the referent יִשְׂרָאֵל plays a central role in these six verses. Many interpreters have noted that the image of Israel as slave and spoil stands in striking contrast to the elevated position in 2.3 (קִדְשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל לַיהוָה).<sup>164</sup> Since 2.14-15 continues YHWH's third-person account *about* Israel's conduct from 2.4-13, the discourse suggests that the development from precious to plundered relates directly to the charges of the previous unit. Having forsaken YHWH (v. 13), the provider and protector (vv. 6-7) for insufficient substitutes (vv. 5b, 8b, 13b), Israel has reaped the inevitable consequences; exchange and withdrawal have led to demise.<sup>165</sup>

The background for the astonishing statement in 2.14 is thus readily supplied by the historical recital of 2.4-13, yet it is not immediately apparent to whom the question is addressed.<sup>166</sup> A verb in second person format does not appear until 2.16 (יִרְעֶנָּה), therefore we must conclude that the identification of YHWH's addressee is delayed and that the referential account in 2.14-15 forms part of his speech to Jerusalem (cf. 2fs-address throughout 2.16-25). In a

---

164. For the connections between 2.1-3 and 2.14-15, see especially Holladay, *Architecture*, p. 37. The unexpected nature of Israel's fall is highlighted by the three-part structure of the rhetorical question; cf. Brueggemann, "Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions," *JBL* 92 (1973): 359-360. Moreover, as noted by Duham (p. 22), a יָלִיד בֵּית, that is, a slave born into a household and bound to it (cf. Lev 22.11), poses a heightened expression from an עֶבֶד who is at times only temporarily tied to his master (cf. Exod 21.2ff; Deut 15.12ff; Jer 34.14).

165. Cf. McKane: "The preceding part of the chapter (vv. 4-13) recounts a history of apostasy and it is this which has brought Israel into weakness and contempt (vv. 14-15)"; p. 38.

166. Cf. Wischnowsky, *Zion*: "Jedoch bietet weder die Frage noch die nachfolgende Klage in V. 15 eine echte Addressierung. Die Klage wirkt wie in den Raum gestellt"; p. 118.

striking parallel to the communication structure of 2.1-3, the opening verses of 2.14-19 constitute a speech by YHWH *about* his people *to* the personified city.

The delayed identification and the reintroduction of Jerusalem suggests that she has overheard the foregoing account of distance and demise. She knows that the fall from splendour to spoil is rooted in Israel's absurd abandonment of YHWH.<sup>167</sup> On the basis of these discourse dynamics, YHWH turns in 2.16 to Jerusalem and directs her attention to her coming destruction at the hand of the Egyptians.<sup>168</sup> Rather than being "intrusive,"<sup>169</sup> the sudden shift to direct address and future perspective serves to launch the rhetorical comparison between city and people: as Israel was torn by lions, so Jerusalem will be destroyed by Egypt.<sup>170</sup> The rationale informing this comparison is presented in 2.17-19 in which YHWH describes the cause for Jerusalem's potential downfall in exactly the same terms as the past collapse of Israel (אֶתִּי עָזְבוּ, v. 13):

- |       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
| v. 17 | הֲלוֹא־זֹאת תַּעֲשֶׂה-לָּךְ<br>עֲזֹבֶדְךָ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ    | Is it not this that will do this to you,<br>that you forsake YHWH, your God?             |
| v. 19 | וְדַעִי וְרֹאִי כִּי־רָע וּמָר<br>עֲזֹבֶדְךָ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ | Then you will know and see how evil and bitter it is<br>that you forsake YHWH, your God! |

---

167. On the basis of Duhm's doubtful criteria ("veränderter Stil und Fehlen des jeremianischen Metrums;" p. 17), some interpreters regard 2.4-13 as a later addition (e.g., Craigie, p. 23; Bright pp. 9-16). Yet, far from being an insertion "die den ursprünglichen Zusammenhang zwischen 2.2aα und 2.14ff endgültig zerstört" (Wischnowsky, *Zion*, p. 115), this section provides in a synchronic reading the necessary explanation for Israel's fall from protected (v. 3) to destroyed (v. 14).

168. Parallel to the switch from 3ms-discourse (הַעֲבֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל) to direct address, 2.16 changes the temporal perspective. After sixteen qatal verbs and seven wayyiqtol verbs in 2.4-15, יִרְעֶיךָ begins a sequence of yiqtol verbs which permeates 2.16-19 (see also vv. 22-23). Cf. Rudolph: "Nun bezieht sich freilich 16 erst auf die Zukunft (Imperf.!)" p. 15.

169. McKane, p. 37. Similar sentiments are voiced by Liwak (cf. *Geschichte*, p. 166), Wischnowsky (cf. *Zion*, p. 118), and Wanke (p. 38).

170. Cf. Holladay: "This casual abruptness adds greatly to its effect in the context"; p. 95. The identity of the lions in 2.15 is debated. Duhm (p. 22) thinks they are the Assyrians (cf. Isa 5.29) and this has been suggested also by Brent A. Strawn, *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (OBO 212; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), p. 52. Holladay (p. 93) detects here instead a cipher for Babylon. For Fischer (p. 163), the identity of the lions remains unspecified.

Couched between these statements, the challenging questions in 2.18 (מֶה-לָּךְ) urges Jerusalem not to repeat Israel's course. In view of what she has observed in the interplay of 2.4-13 and 2.14-15, Jerusalem should follow YHWH's leading rather than the nations (cf. דֶּרֶךְ, vv. 17-18).<sup>171</sup> The sustenance that these luring allies promise (מִי שָׁחֹר/מִי נָהָר, v. 18) will prove just as deceptive as those of Israel's useless gods (לֹא-יִכְלֹ הָמִים, v. 13).<sup>172</sup> Founded on the interplay of address and reference across 2.1-19 and these explicit connections to the failure and fall of the people (עֵזֶב; מִים), the comparative rhetoric of 2.14-19 can be summarized like this:

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| vv. 14-15 | Why have enemies overthrown Israel?<br>Because the nation has abandoned YHWH (cf. vv. 4-13). |
| v. 16     | You, Jerusalem, will also fall by enemy attack!  |
| vv. 17-19 | And why will this come upon you?<br>Because you are abandoning YHWH (just as Israel did)!    |

YHWH's speech to Jerusalem in 2.14-19 thus articulates a historical object lesson. The inconceivable collapse of YHWH's treasured people fronts the unit in order to turn her away from destructive allegiances and back to trusting solely in her leader and protector.<sup>173</sup> In view of this precedent set before her, the

---

171. For דֶּרֶךְ as a metaphor for "Politisches Verhalten," see Markus P. Zehnder, *Wegmetaphorik im Alten Testament* (BZAW 268; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), pp. 517; specifically for 2.17-18, see Hardmeier ("Redekomposition," p. 28) and Biddle (*Redaction*, p. 71). While Böhler understands the reference to Assyria to indicate a northern audience (cf. "Geschlechterdifferenz," p. 122), McConville has argued that the situation is more complex: "The best interpretation of the couplet is that, as the northern kingdom [i.e., Israel] was disappointed in its trust in Assyria, so Judah will be disappointed in its trust in Egypt"; *Promise*, pp. 32-33. For an overview of proposals related to the Egypt/Assyria couplet, see Liwak (*Geschichte*, pp. 164-174) and Herrmann (pp. 130-137).

172. Cf. Stulman: "To trust in Assyria and Egypt is to delude oneself"; p. 51. For the water-link between 2.13 and 2.18, see, e.g., Craigie, p. 33. For further parallels between city and people, note הָלַךְ אַחֵר in 2.5, 8, 23-25, טָמָא in 2.7, 23<sup>aa</sup>, and בָּעַל in 2.8, 23.

173. Cf. Hardmeier, "Geschichte": "JHWH erwartet jetzt, daß sich Jerusalem von den bitteren Folgen dieser falschen Bindungen belehren und zurechtweisen läßt. Die selbst verschuldete negative Geschichtserfahrung, die in 2.14f angesprochen wird, soll zur Lehrmeisterin für die Gegenwart werden"; p. 4. Schmidt entitles 2.14-19 with "Laß dir dein Unglück zum Zuchtmeister werden!"; *Propheten*, p. 230.

refusal to act in this way would be fatal and inexplicable—and yet she abandons YHWH, does not heed his warnings, and spurns fearing him (v. 19). In this scenario, the causal link (כי) of 2.20 indicates that an explanation for Jerusalem’s withdrawal now follows. The frame and quotations in 2.20-25 spell out in more detail the nature, extent, and rationale that underlies Jerusalem’s absurd abandonment of YHWH.<sup>174</sup>

### 3. Frame and Insets in 2.20-25

2.20	<p> כִּי מֵעוֹלָם שָׁבַרְתִּי עֲלֶיךָ  נִתְקַתִּי מוֹסְרֹתֶיךָ  וְתֹאמְרִי לֹא אֶעֱבֹד  כִּי עַל-כָּל-גִּבְעָה גְבוּהָהּ  וְתַחַת כָּל-עֵץ רֵעִזָּן  אַתָּה צָעָה זֹנָה </p>	<p> For in time past, I broke your yoke,  I burst your bonds.  But you said: “I will not serve.”  But on every high hill  and under every green tree,  you are bent over whoring! </p>
2.21	<p> וְאֲנֹכִי נִטְעֵתִיךָ שֵׁרֶק  כֻּלָּהּ זֶרַע אֲמֵת  וְאִידָךְ נִהְפָּכְתָּ לִּי  סוּרֵי הַגֶּפֶן נִכְרִיָּה </p>	<p> I had planted you as a choice vine  entirely of wholesome seed.  How you have turned yourself before me,  and become warped  as the tendrils of a wild vine! </p>
2.22	<p> כִּי אִם-תִּכְבֹּסִי בַנָּתָר  וְתִרְבִּי-לֶךְ בְּרִית  נִכְתָּם עוֹנֶךָ לִפְנֵי  נָאִם אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה </p>	<p> Even if you wash yourself with natron  and scrub yourself with salt,  the stain of your iniquity remains before me.  —Speech of Lord YHWH— </p>
2.23	<p> אִידָךְ תֹּאמְרִי לֹא נִטְמָאתִי  אַחֲרֵי הַבְּעָלִים לֹא הִלַּכְתִּי  רְאֵי דֶרֶךְךָ בַּגִּיאָה  דְּעֵי מָה עָשִׂיתִי  בְּכִרְהָהּ קָלָה מְשַׁרְכֶּת דֶּרֶכֶיהָ </p>	<p> How can you say: “I am not unclean!  After the Baalim I have not gone!”  Look at your way in the valley!  Consider what you have done!  A swift camel, chasing to and fro on her way, </p>
2.24	<p>פֶּרָה לִמְדַּם מִדְבָּר</p>	<p>a wild ass, accustomed to the wilderness.</p>

174. Cf. Weiser: “Was dort [vv. 14-19] mehr allgemein andeutend gesagt war, wird hier [vv. 20-25] konkreter und durch wechselnde Bilder anschaulicher und andringender zur Sprache gebracht”; p. 25.

	בְּאוֹת נִפְשָׁהּ שָׁאָפָה רוּחַ	In her heat, she sniffs the wind,
	תִּאֲנֶתָהּ מִי יְשִׁיבֶנָּה	in her desire, who can bring her back?
	כָּל-מְבַקְשֶׁיהָ לֹא יִיעֲפוּ	All who search for her will not be wearied.
	בְּחַדְשָׁהּ יִמְצְאוּנָהּ	In her season, they will find her.
2.25	מִנְעִי רִגְלְךָ מִיַּחַר	Keep your foot from going bare
	וּגְרוֹנְךָ מִצְמָאָה	and your throat from thirst!
	וְתֹאמְרִי נֹאֵשׁ לֹא	But you said: "Forget it! No!
	כִּי-אֶהְבֵּתִי זָרִים	For I love strangers
	וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם אֵלֶּךְ	and after them I will go."

YHWH's address to Jerusalem in these verses shows no marks of the comparative rhetoric and the entwined communication structures of the previous sections. Instead, 2.20-25 is saturated with images (yoke, plant, soap, animals) that change quickly and are interwoven with a range of exclamations, questions, and imperatives.<sup>175</sup> While this varied configuration suffices to trouble any formal or thematic categorization, the speech quotations in 2.20, 23, and 25 add further intricacy to YHWH's fast-paced address. The question of how these quotations are integrated amidst the metaphors and other framing elements in 2.20-25 will occupy the central place in our analysis; however, the particulars of their location, phrasing, and interrelationship likewise demand careful attention. Placed close to the opening of the first sub-division (vv. 20-22) and at the boundaries of the second section (vv. 23-25), the insets are framed at prominent positions of the discourse and formulate a sequence of negative statements across the unit:

v. 20a	לֹא אֶעֱבֹד
v. 23a	לֹא נִטְמַאתִי אַחֲרֵי הַבְּעָלִים לֹא הִלַּכְתִּי
v. 25b	נֹאֵשׁ לֹא כִּי-אֶהְבֵּתִי זָרִים וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם אֵלֶּךְ

---

175. Cf. Rudolph: "Sichjagen der Bilder mit schroffen Wechseln"; p. 15. Duhm relates the rapid change of topics to the inexperience of the young Jeremiah: "Der junge Dichter versteht mit seinem Reichtum noch nicht recht Haus zu halten, weiss noch nicht, dass oft ein Weniger mehr ist"; p. 25.

Observing our division between 2.20-22 and 2.23-25, we will proceed to address these characteristics by an examination of the frame-inset relationships that occur within these two individual sections. Subsequently, the results of these analyses will be combined in an integrated reading of 2.20-25.

### **3.1. Frame and Inset in 2.20-22**

The first quotation in 2.20-25 is placed within an intricate verse which shifts throughout its poetic and structural arrangement from redemption to accusation, from speech to action, and from bondage to idols. For this reasons, we will begin our analysis with a detailed discussion of 2.20 which seeks to determine the integration and function of Jerusalem's quoted words. Once this task has been executed, we will relate our results to the images and rhetoric of 2.21-22.

#### **3.1.1. "I will not serve" (2.20)**

Although the discourse of 2.20-22 opens like that of 2.4-9 with a reference to the past (מֵעוֹלָם), there are two important differences which should be noted. First, rather than accusing Jerusalem of previous failures (cf. מִצָּאָה/רָחֵק, vv. 5-6), YHWH recalls his gracious deliverance. From its first line, the frame of 2.20-22 emphasizes YHWH's redemptive initiative and thus reaffirms his favourable attitude towards the city as articulated in 2.1-3 (cf. לִי, v. 2a). Second, while 2.5 posited a personal point of reference for the addressed Judahites ("your fathers"), the time frame (מֵעוֹלָם) and the events to which the broken bondage allude remain unspecified.<sup>176</sup> In view of the Egypt/Assyria couplet in 2.18 and

---

176. The form מֵעוֹלָם appears elsewhere in Jeremiah only in the unspecified enemy description in 5.15 (cf. Gen 6.4). Kimchi suspects here a reference to Egypt (cf. *Miqra'ot*, p. 12) and this is also postulated by some modern interpreters, such as Fischer (p. 166) and Rom-Shiloni, "How can you say," p. 760. See, however, Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Der historische Bezug is



the political yoke-idiom in 2.20,<sup>177</sup> we can ascertain that YHWH's liberation of the city relates to oppressive nations. Beyond this basic understanding, however, the text remains silent. Hence, the emphasis of YHWH's first words to Jerusalem in 2.20-25 rests not on any particular, historical incident, but rather—and this is enforced by its twofold articulation—on his saving intervention on her behalf.

Having thus established that Jerusalem owes her freedom to YHWH, the *verbum dicendi* וְתֹאמַרִי introduces her first quoted inset, “I will not serve” (לֹא אֶעֱבֹד), which ends before 2.20b (cf. כִּי/אֵת). Framed as the direct sequel to YHWH's opening words, this quotation is commonly understood in the vein of Wolff's antithesis, namely, as a refusal to serve YHWH.<sup>178</sup> While the juxtaposition between the two speeches in 2.20a is evident, the inset neither mentions YHWH nor contains a pronominal reference or address to him. Present in some of the Greek witnesses, such communicative markers are frequently added also in modern translations.<sup>179</sup> According to the rendition in Jer-MT, however, the inset's deictic perspective is centered entirely on Jerusalem. The sequence of the discourse may prompt us to infer a dialogical, antithetical relationship, yet YHWH's addressee is depicted as talking not to him, but past him. Jerusalem's sharp and self-absorbed declaration is best understood in broader terms as expressing her determination not to serve anyone at all, regardless of whether

---

blasser als vorher, die Schuld bezieht sich auf unabsehbare Zeiten (מֵעוֹלָם); p. 174.

177. For yoke-imagery in the HB and the ANE, see Bozak (“Heeding,” p. 528) and Biddle, *Redaction*: “The picture is universally of oppressive political dominion and overlordship”; p. 51; see, e.g., 1 Kgs 12.4. As Herrmann (p. 139) and Foreman (*Animal*, pp. 190-191) have argued, the lacking reference to a bull or oxen forecloses interpreting 2.20 as an animal metaphor; so, e.g., Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*, p. 35 (“ein Arbeitstier, das das Joch abzuschütteln versucht”), Rudolph (p. 15), and Holladay (p. 97).

178. So, e.g., Lundbom (p. 278), Fretheim (p. 69), Craigie (p. 37), Carroll (p. 130), Schmidt (p. 91). Wolff comments only on the authenticity of 2.20 (“vielleicht echt”; “Zitat,” p. 71).

179. See, e.g., Duhm: “Ich will [dir] nicht dienen”; p. 24; McKane: “I will not be subject to you”; p. 39; NIV; NET; CEB; NLT. Wolff (“Zitat,” p. 71), Cornill, (p. 23), and Volz (p. 24) base their translations on the reading in LXX-Vaticanus (οὐ δουλεύσω σοι) which appears also in the Lucian recension.

this is YHWH or some other deity or nation.<sup>180</sup>

If not as a specific refutation, how does the inset relate to the framing perspective of YHWH's deliverance? The answer to this question emerges from the imbalance that marks the relationship between frame (2.20a $\alpha$ ) and inset (2.20a $\beta$ ). YHWH's extensive and affirmative account (שְׁבַרְתִּי/נִתְקַתִּי) is set against Jerusalem's short and negative declaration (לֹא אֶעֱבֹד). Likewise, the deictic dynamics of his speech ("I broke *your* yoke") are contrasted with her egocentric perspective. This disparity indicates Jerusalem's communicative detachment and shows her disregard for YHWH's crucial contribution to her freedom. Not only is there no grateful response,<sup>181</sup> but any acknowledgment of YHWH or his deeds for her is absent. Set in the frame of his redemption, her self-centred perspective hence creates a conversational lapse—YHWH addresses her, she does not reply to him—and portrays Jerusalem as indifferent to YHWH's benevolence. Concerned only with herself, she speaks past her redeemer.

YHWH continues his verbal initiative in spite of this communicative aloofness. As the framing response to the self-absorbed inset, the discourse moves in 2.20b from serving nations to serving other deities.<sup>182</sup> The generic references to trees and hills remain as unspecific as the references to

---

180. This interpretation is given *en passant* by Ortlund ("Renouncing allegiance to Yahweh [or to anyone else, for that matter]"; *Wife*, pp. 84-85) and correlates with the broad use of עֲבַד in Jeremiah. Apart from personal references, such as YHWH's prophetic servants or Zedekiah's attendants (e.g., 7.25; 22.2-4), the theme of servitude appears with reference to other gods (e.g., 5.19; 8.2; 11.10; 13.10; 16.11-13; 22.9; 25.6; 44.3) and foreign nations alike (e.g., 17.4; 25.14; 27.7-17; 30.8; 40.9); cf. Holladay: "The verb עֲבַד [in 2.20] then has political overtones as well as religious ones"; p. 97. While many of these passages are implicit accusations against *not* serving YHWH, the only explicit connection of עֲבַד and יְהוָה in Jeremiah occurs in the restoration promise of 30.9.

181. Craigie (p. 37) detects in the quotation "profound ingratitude."

182. The phrase עַל-כָּל-גִּבְעָה וְנִתְחַת כָּל-עֵץ רֵעָן appears in whole or with variations sixteen times, often with explicit references to the worship of other deities (e.g., Deut 12.2; 1 Kgs 14.23; Isa 57.5-7; Jer 17.2). Cf. Holladay, "On Every High Hill and Under Every Green Tree," *VT* 11 (1961): 170-176; Susan Ackerman, *Under Every Green Tree: Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah* (HSM 46; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992).

Jerusalem's bonds to foreign nations,<sup>183</sup> and so the discourse maintains its focus on YHWH and the city. Indicated by the adversative **וְ**, the quick succession of political and religious dimensions confronts her quoted words:

- v. 20aα YHWH: I have released you from serving other nations.  
v. 20aβ Jerusalem: I will not serve.  
v. 20b YHWH: But you *are* serving, namely, other deities!

By virtue of this framing operation, the city's self-assured freedom is placed between YHWH (her past liberator) and the other deities (her new lords) in order to formulate three arguments. First, Jerusalem's service to the other gods confirms her absent acknowledgment of YHWH's redemption which, by implication, would demand her undivided devotion. Second, her determination not to be ruled by anyone at all clashes with her indiscriminate service on *every* hill and under *every* tree. Third, the framing construction introduces the biting accusation that Jerusalem has abused YHWH's liberation in such an absurd manner as to put herself once again in bondage.<sup>184</sup>

This self-destructive quality is accentuated in the statement which closes the frame: "you are bent over whoring" (**אַתָּה צָעָה זָנָה**). Alongside a few unconvincing attempts to detect here an instance of an alleged marriage metaphor,<sup>185</sup> the adjacent mention of hill tops has led interpreters frequently to

---

183. According to Fischer (p. 166), YHWH's words in 2.20b "spielen auf die Verehrung fremder Gottheiten an, ohne sie jedoch zu nennen."

184. Cf. McKane comments on "the irrationality of the manner in which she has exercised her freedom"; p. 42. This absurdity is brought out more strongly in Jer-LXX in which the inset includes all of 2.20b (*καὶ εἶπας Οὐ δουλεύσω, ἀλλὰ πορεύσομαι ἐπὶ πάντα βουνὸν ὑψηλὸν καὶ ὑποκάτω παντὸς ξύλου κατασκίου, ἐκεῖ διαχυθήσομαι ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ μου*). In this reading, the feminine speaker not only contradicts her assertion of autonomy but also blatantly declares her devotion to other deities. Since this declaration is reserved in Jer-MT for the inset in 2.25b, the divergence of the insets in 2.20-25 shows that the differences between Jer-MT and Jer-LXX cannot be explained exclusively by recourse to textual criticism. Instead, both versions must be recognized as "alternative performances"; for more details, see Diamond and O'Connor, "Passions," pp. 134-141.

185. See Moughtin-Mumby's assessment of such proposals; *Sexual*, p. 97. Cf. Abma, *Marriage*: "The verb **זָנָה** functions in Jer 2.20 primarily as a standard term in the context of idolatry and false worship. . . . The notion of an existing marriage relationship does not seem to

regard this phrase as a literal reference to cultic prostitution.<sup>186</sup> Yet, the lexeme זנה occurs in the Hebrew Bible frequently in a metaphorical sense and, as argued by Barstad, Foreman, and others, the evidence for such an institution in Israel is still lacking.<sup>187</sup> It is, then, advisable to avoid cultic speculations and to regard the constellation זנה צעה on its own terms. In addition to the obvious phonetic connection (*ṣō'āh zōnāh*), especially the doubling of participles and also their final position in the verse suggests that זנה צעה functions as a hendiadys.<sup>188</sup> Since both verbs alike relate to the subject Jerusalem (lit., “you are bending whoring”), they complement each other in order to launch an incisive assessment of her pursuits. Her unfaithful whoring away from YHWH, the agent of her release from toil and duress, is characterized by oppressive drudgery.<sup>189</sup>

---

be presupposed”; p. 240.

186. The combination of צעה and זנה has elicited explicit speculations; see, e.g., Holladay (“intercourse from the rear”; p. 98) or, with reference to suggestive Egyptian paintings, Lundbom (p. 277). See further Volz, p. 24; Rudolph, p. 16; Craigie, p. 37; Wanke, p. 40; Friedrich Nötscher, *Das Buch Jeremias* (HSAT; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1934), p. 43.

187. Cf. Barstad, *The Religious Polemics of Amos: Studies in the Preaching of Am 2.7b-8; 4.1-13; 5.1-27; 6.4-7; 8.14* (VTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1984), pp. 21-33; Foreman, *Animal*, pp. 121-128. While זנה refers literally to prostitutes or individuals of “immoral” character (e.g., Gen 38.15; Num 25.1; Josh 2.1; 6.17-25; Jdg 11.1; 1 Kgs 13.16; Joel 3.3; Prov 6.26), its metaphorical use frequently describes Israel’s devotion to other gods (e.g., Exod 34.15-16; Lev 17.7; Deut 31.16; Jdg 8.33; Ezek 6.9; Hos 4.12; Ps 106.39; 2 Chr 21.11-13). Elsewhere, it refers to whoring after human mediums (Lev 20.6), the desire of heart and eyes (Num 15.39), an ephod (Jdg 8.27), or other nations (Isa 23.17; Ezek 16.28; 23.3).

188. For זנה to be a part. rather than a noun, see Giesebrecht (p. 10) and Holladay (p. 98). On hendiadys in the HB in general, see Watson, *Poetry*, pp. 324-328. Examples of other participial hendiadys in Jeremiah can be found in 5.23 (סורר ומוקרה) and in 50.9 (מעיר ומעלה). In Fischer’s view, the two participles express continuity (“bis in die Gegenwart”; p. 167).

189. The verb צעה appears elsewhere only four times. In Isa 51.14, it may refer to an oppressed and crushed person (“the stooped”) whom YHWH will set free (פתח, Ni.); so, e.g., John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 344; John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40-55: Volume II* (ICC; London: T&T Clark, 2006), p. 243. Joseph Blenkinsopp translates “the one who now cowers,” but observes that the Ni. of פתח is nowhere else used to mean “setting free”; *Isaiah 40-55* (AB 19; New York: Doubleday, 2000), pp. 329-330. The reference in Isa 63.1, while at times emended to צעד (“stride”; cf. BHS), may denote a man bending forward or “stooping under the weight of his armor”; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (rev. ed.; WBC 25; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2000), pp. 884-885. The two occurrences in Jer 48.12 describe the destruction of Moab through the image of tipped over and crushed vessels (כלי; cf. 18.14; 22.28). According to Fischer, צעה denotes here “aufbrauchendes und zerstörerisches Handeln”; *Jeremia 26-52* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2005), p. 511. There

This interpretation has implications for our understanding of the frame-inset relationship that is constructed across 2.20, especially regarding its poetic configuration. The verse evenly divides into four lines: the two כִּי-clauses in 2.20aα and 2.20bα, both with six words each, are concerned with YHWH and the other gods; the two clauses in 2.20aβ and 2.20bβ, both with three words each, are concerned with Jerusalem's speech and actions. This arrangement contrasts YHWH's past deliverance and the city's new gods and also juxtaposes Jerusalem's demonstration of self-declared independence with the description of her self-chosen dependence.<sup>190</sup> The inset depicts Jerusalem as being bent *on freedom*, but its framing via the compounded wordplay זָנָה צָעָה depicts her real situation as being bent *in service*.

Before we turn our attention to the remaining two verses of this unit, we will briefly summarize our observations thus far. After the frame opens with YHWH's redemption of Jerusalem, the quoted inset is integrated within its communicative, structural, and poetic profile in order to portray the city's absent acknowledgment for her liberation. Indicated by the frame's vague mention of her past bonds and her current devotion, the primary role of the inset is not referential but relational. As our analysis of its deictic and communicative configuration has shown, the city does not enter into dialogue with YHWH. Despite his verbal efforts—he speaks sixteen words, Jerusalem only two—she is depicted as talking past him and as being concerned only with her claims of absolute autonomy. In the framing enclosure of YHWH's initial address and the quick transition from political liberty to religious labours, the inset exposes Jerusalem as an inaccessible and incoherent conversation partner. She

---

remain, then, some difficulties in determining the precise meaning of this verb, yet none of these passages supports the translation of צָעָה as “sprawling” (Holladay, p. 53; NRSV; NET) or “lay down” (McKane, p. 39; NKJV; TNIV).

190. Pace Bozak who thinks that the closing line “indicates how the Israelites realized in deeds what they expressed in words”; “Heeding,” p. 535.

is ignorant of whom she owes her freedom and blind to who currently owns her. The poetic juxtaposition between her demonstrative words and YHWH's descriptive account grounds her self-assurance in self-delusion which, if not recognized, will steer towards self-destruction.

### 3.1.2. The Images of Vine and Soap (2.21-22)

Similar to our approach to 2.4-9 and 2.10-13, we will now examine how this contribution of the framed inset in 2.20 may prepare or be further developed by the material that succeeds it. The direct sequel in 2.21 reaffirms the elevated portrayal of YHWH's initiative from 2.20 by means of an agricultural image (נִטְעָתִיד שִׁירָק). As elsewhere in Jeremiah, this language of planting (נָטַע), often in conjunction with building (בָּנָה) expresses YHWH's benevolent intentions.<sup>191</sup> The discourse thus advances from the image of the yoke to that of the vine, yet it launches the same accusation of Jerusalem's abused freedom: YHWH has liberated her, yet she goes to other deities; YHWH has planted her, yet she grows contrary to his expectations (הִפְךָ).<sup>192</sup> Beyond this affirmative function, however, the imagery asserts that Jerusalem not only owes her autonomy but, in fact, her very existence to YHWH. Her life is rooted in his initial act of planting and has always been dependent on his care and cultivation.<sup>193</sup> While the quotation was

---

191. With the exception of 32.41, נָטַע is always conjoined with בָּנָה when it appears in promises of restoration (cf. 1.10; 18.9; 24.6; 29.5, 28; 31.4-5, 28; 42.10). When נָטַע appears without בָּנָה, it is used as a foil for destruction; cf. 11.17; 12.2-3 (with נָתַק); 45.4-5 (with נָתַשׁ).

192. Cf. Wischnowsky, *Zion*: "Pervertierung der von Jahwe intendierten Daseinsberechtigung"; p. 123. In addition to Hos 10.1, Isa 5.1-7 is often evoked in relation to 2.21 (e.g., Duhm, p. 25; Carroll, p. 131; Wendel, *Jesaja*, pp. 11-29). Jindo highlights the verbal links with Judah's blessing in Gen 49 (שִׁירָק/גֶּפֶן/כֶּבֶשׂ): "The oracle in Jer 2.21-22 reverses the meaning of the imagery in Gen 49:11 from blessedness to corruption. This ironic twist expresses the divine frustration at the 'choicest grapes,' expected to be the ultimate symbol of blessing, turning into the utterly corrupt grape"; *Metaphor*, p. 185.

193. The combination of זֶרַע + אִמָּת occurs only here, emphasizing Jerusalem's highly promising beginnings under YHWH's good hand. There is no support for Abel's suggestion that the use of אִמָּת in this verse, with inference to Hos 4.1-3, is a veiled reference to "relational

framed to expose her failure to respond appropriately to YHWH's gift of freedom, this manoeuvre extends this failure to include YHWH's gift of life as well. Too pretentious to serve him and too self-centred to speak to him, she acts as if her life was void of any responsibility to him who gave it to her. In addition to the exclamation אֵיךְ in 2.21b, the resulting divine frustration manifests itself in the fronted pronoun וְאַנְכִי in 2.21a. Both as a response to her actions (cf. אַתָּה, v. 20bβ) and to her warped development, this emphatic self-reference reaffirms the perspective of YHWH's gracious initiative: it was me who gave you life, yet you go after other gods; it was me who has kept and nourished you, yet you destroy yourself in weary service.

The image of soap and washing in 2.22 takes the assertion of the frame-inset relationship of 2.20 to yet another level. Like some of the other passages in which כִּבֵּס is used metaphorically, such as the address to Jerusalem in 4.14 (כִּבֵּסִי יְרוּשָׁלַם מִרְעָה לִבְדָּה) or the appeals in Psalm 51,<sup>194</sup> this verse also speaks of eradicating a record of iniquity (cf. עֵוֹן, v. 22b; Ps 51.4). After the characterization that 2.20-21 has advanced, however, this mention of internal cleansing is placed here not as a hopeful appeal but as a rhetorical foil. Jerusalem's aloof speech and her overthrow of YHWH's good plans demonstrate that she does not feel any guilt at all. For her to wash and wake up to her present state remains a hypothetical scenario (כִּי אִם),<sup>195</sup> included in the discourse only to emphasize the deeply ingrained character of her iniquities. In proportion to her blindness towards her self-contradictions and the dangers of her new bonds, she also shows herself ignorant to the depth of her corruption. The washing image closes

---

language," even less to an alleged marriage metaphor; cf. "Marriage," p. 22.

194. Cf. Ps 51.4 (כִּבֵּסִי מִעֲוֹנִי) and Ps 51.9 (תְּחַטְּאֵנִי/תְּכַבֵּסֵנִי). The only other use of כִּבֵּס that does not denote the washing of clothes (cf. 2 Sam 19.25) is found in Mal 3.2 and concerns the purification attending the coming of YHWH's messenger (כִּבֵּסִים מְכַבְּרִית וְכִבְרִית מְכַבְּסִים).

195. For this use of the compounded conjunction כִּי אִם, see, e.g., Exod 8.21; 9.2; Deut 11.22; Isa 10.22; Jer 7.5; 37.10; Hos 9.12; Prov 2.3; Eccl 4.10.

the unit of 2.20-22 with the dire assertion that Jerusalem's break-away from YHWH has reached a point of no return.<sup>196</sup> Her guilt cannot be washed away; her words and actions have permanently spoiled her standing before YHWH (לְפָנָי).

### 3.1.3. Conclusion

The abrupt change of the imagery in 2.20-22 is an appropriate reflection of the various and overlapping dimensions of Jerusalem's iniquity. Her failure is a mixture of ingratitude, willful ignorance, thwarted expectations, and irreparable corruption. What underlies all of these dimensions, however, is her self-absorption and her failure to respond appropriately to YHWH. Subsumed under his gracious initiative (vv. 20a, 21a) and integrated within the quick shift of political and religious allegiances and the juxtaposition of word and deed, Jerusalem's quotation portrays her as a non-communicative and irrational character. Her arbitrary submission to the other gods and her twisted growth is rooted in her failure to see the good that YHWH has done for her and to recognize the consequences of her attachment to other lords. In the frame of 2.20 and the expansion and exposition that is provided by 2.21-22, the first inset of Jerusalem in 2.1-3.5 thus introduces her as a headstrong and deeply corrupted character. She has grown contrary to YHWH's good intentions and manifests herself as too self-centred and self-assured to articulate an appropriate reaction to his address.

---

196. Cf. McKane: "Scepticism about the possibility of reformation"; p. 43. Schulz-Rauch has proposed that the uncleansable guilt is related to cultic impurity (most of the non-metaphorical occurrences of כִּבֹּשׁ relate to ceremonial washing; e.g., Exod 19.10-14; Lev 11-17 [×30]; Num 8.7, 21; 19 [×6]; 31.24; see also Rom-Shiloni, "How can you say," p. 772). He cautiously draws an inference from a Mischnaic regulation (Nidda 9.6) concerning a so-called דִּם טָמֵא in order to elucidate the hapax legomena נִכְרָסִים. If accepted, this would indicate that 2.22 speaks of a bloodstain (cf. Targum; Duhm, p. 25) which would pose a "nicht behebbarer Unreinheit"; *Hosea*, p. 48.



The interplay of frame and inset in 2.20-22 provides an apt explanation for her inconceivable abandonment of YHWH that is presented in 2.14-19. Since her determination to speak and act only on her terms leaves no room for YHWH's penetrating portrayal of her current state, it is only to be expected that she also resists the insights from the lessons of the past. Despite the historical precedent set before her eyes, she will not stop her irrational march away from her redeemer and life-giver. In this scenario, the explicit connection to servitude (cf. עבד, vv. 14, 20) foreshadows the looming downfall of the unteachable city: if Israel, who was no slave, has fallen because of abandoning YHWH, how much harder will Jerusalem collapse who has enslaved herself willfully and indiscriminately to other gods?

### 3.2. Frame and Insets in 2.23-25

The speech quotations in 2.23-25 continue YHWH's exposition in 2.20-22 in a number of significant ways. As introduced in our text analysis above, 2.23-25 is arranged as a concentric structure in which the metaphors of camel and ass assume the central place. Due to its medial position, its relative length, and its departure from the consistent 2fs-address of the unit—in 2.16-25, only 2.23b-24 contains referential speech—the account of the two animals governs the structure of 2.23-25:

v. 23a $\alpha$	speech quotation	תאמר
v. 23a $\beta$	2fs-imperatives	ראי/דעי
v. 23b-24	animal imagery (בכרה/פרה)	ה-/ה
v. 25a	2fs-imperative	מנעי
v. 25b	speech quotation	ותאמר

This arrangement and also their lexical correspondence suggests some type of relationship between the two quotations that open and close the passage:

v. 23aα      לא נטמאתי אחרי הבָּעָלִים לא הִלַכְתִּי  
 v. 25b      נואֵשׁ לוֹא כִּי־אַהֲבֹתִי זָרִים וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם אֵלֶךְ

While both phrases are stated like the inset in 2.20 as negative expressions, the distribution and function of their negative particles is markedly different: 2.23aα sets two constructions of לוֹא + verb in sequence, 2.25b combines לוֹא with the participle נואֵשׁ. Moreover, the two insets exhibit a contradictory use of the phrase הִלַךְ + אחרי, first used in denial, then in affirmation: I have not gone after the Baals, I will go after strangers.<sup>197</sup> The alternative reading in Jer-LXX may reflect an attempt to resolve this overt incongruity;<sup>198</sup> the various solutions proposed by the commentators betray the same motivation: some exegetes delete the הִלַךְ-phrases altogether, others read 2.25b in conjunction with 2.26-27 or, as Biddle has it, with 2.33-34,<sup>199</sup> and still others have wondered whether the two insets may stem from two different quoted speakers.<sup>200</sup> In the end, however, none of these proposals is convincing. In light of the chiastic structure of 2.23-25, the consistent 2fs-address across 2.16-25, and the strong break between 2.25 and 2.26, the tension between the quotations must be left intact.

---

197. Cf. Overholt, "Problem": "What the quotation of v. 23 denies, that of v. 25 admits, a curious kind of contradiction indeed"; p. 268. Wolff restricts his observations to the question of authenticity, declaring 2.25b as fictitious because its "Selbsturteil ist im Munde des Volkes undenkbar"; "Zitat," p. 71.

198. Jer-LXX restricts the inset in 2.25b to Ἀνδριοῦμαι. In accordance with the 3ms-*verbum dicendi* (εἶπεν), the rest of the verse is placed as a referential account on YHWH's lips (ὅτι ἡγαπήκει ἀλλοτρίους καὶ ὁπίσω αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο) who is thus shown to give an explanation for Jerusalem's denial. For a brief discussion of this "alternative performance," see Diamond and O'Connor, "Passions," p. 139.

199. In Duhm's view (pp. 25-27; followed by Cornill, p. 25), both הִלַךְ-phrases are illogical additions. Volz (p. 24) and Rudolph (p. 16) excise לא הִלַכְתִּי from 2.23a. Lundbom, otherwise so astutely aware of rhetorical structures, breaks up the chiasm of 2.23-25 because "the people cannot deny going after the Baals, and then be quoted in the same oracle as saying they are hopelessly attached to the same"; p. 280. According to Herrmann's redaction (p. 145), 2.25b is a later addition that has "keinen direkten Bezug mehr zu V. 25a." For Biddle's rearrangement, see *Redaction*, p. 56.

200. Cf. Schmidt: "Spiegeln V. 23.25 eventuell verschiedene Positionen von Gruppen—im Gegenüber zu Jeremia—wider?"; p. 90.

Instead of trying to resolve or reconstruct this scenario, the two insets must be understood within their full contextual parameters. Any understanding of their interrelationship and, for that matter, of their placement, integration, and function, must be grounded in an analysis of their respective phrasing and framing in 2.23-25.

### 3.2.1. “I am not unclean” (2.23aα)

The question particle which opens 2.23 indicates a new step in YHWH’s address (אִיךָ; cf. vv. 5, 11, 14, 17-18).<sup>201</sup> Despite the hopelessness that 2.20-22 depicted, YHWH again engages the defiant city. In a construction parallel to that of 2.20a, the quoted inset of 2.23aα, identified by אָמַר and marked off by the imperative רָא in 2.23aβ, is phrased as a self-referential and negative statement. Evolving from the previous quotation, however, it consists of two constructions of “לֹא + verb”: according to the words that are attributed to Jerusalem, she is not unclean (לֹא נִטְמָאָה), she has not gone after the Baalim (לֹא הִלַּכְתִּי). Due to the absence of a conjunction in the Hebrew text (cf. Jer-LXX: καὶ), the parallelism of these two phrases denotes an ascending argumentation in which the second statement is meant to reaffirm the veracity of the first.<sup>202</sup> By means of this subsidiary, self-declared abstinence from the Baals, Jerusalem is depicted as making an extra effort in the defence of her intact purity.

A statement such as this could be understood on its own terms in a positive way. Since the phrase הלך + אחרי has appeared so far only to denote

---

201. Herrmann ascribes to אִיךָ here “eine vermittelnde Funktion, die nach der Abschlußformel V. 22 eine Art Neubeginn, aber im gleichen Sachzusammenhang, darstellt”; p. 143.

202. As in 2.7 (with הוֹעֲבָה), the remaining three occurrences of טָמֵא in Jeremiah relate to idol worship (7.3; 19.13; 32.34). In Carroll’s view (p. 132), it is not clear whether the quotation denies devotion to the Baalim or that such devotion causes defilement (so, e.g., Duhm, p. 25). In view of the parallelism of the two phrases, it appears unlikely to disconnect the other gods from the notion of defilement. The correlation of טָמֵא and בָּעִלִּים is indicated also by the inverted word order of the second phrase (cf. Holladay, p. 100).

Israel's wayward behaviour (vv. 5b, 8b) or Jerusalem's devotion to YHWH (v. 2b), a commitment *not* to walk after the Baals would be, if treated in isolation, an ideal declaration. Yet, in its immediate context and also in relation to the consistently incriminating use of הלך + לא in Jeremiah,<sup>203</sup> Jerusalem's words are framed to articulate the exact opposite. As in 2.21b (וְאֵיךְ נִהְפַכְתָּ), the particle אֵיךְ in 2.23a does not ask for an answer but serves primarily to expose the inexplicable nature of what follows. The divine frustration in 2.23a, however, is not sparked by the disproportion between planting and development, but by the chasm between Jerusalem's double-denial and the record of her actions: her indiscriminate service (v. 20) stands against her refusal of all other gods,<sup>204</sup> her warped conduct (v. 21) undermines her assertion of straight walking, and her permanent stain (v. 22) shows her denial of defilement to be far from the truth. The contrastive frame of YHWH's discourse and the modified *verbum dicendi* (אֵיךְ תֹאמְרִי) expose Jerusalem's words as a blatant lie.<sup>205</sup> But there is more: given how openly and drastically her verbal demonstration of innocence collides with the vivid description of her guilt, Jerusalem is framed to speak without any reference to YHWH's account in 2.20-22; she speaks as if he had not spoken.

---

203. Leaving aside the references to Babylon (37.9) and Moab (48.11), every occurrence of הלך + לא in Jeremiah denotes a failure to walk in YHWH's ways (6.16; 7.6; 9.12; 32.23; 44.10, 23). The only positive instance appears in the promise of restoration in 3.17 (וְלֹא-יָלְכוּ עוֹד אֲחֵרִי (שְׁרָרוֹת לְפָנֵי הָרָע).

204. The plural of בעל may refer to the numerous local manifestations of Baal worship (so, e.g., Allen, p. 48; J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* [NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980], p. 178; cf. *DDD*, p. 136; John Day, "Hosea and the Baal Cult," in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* [LHB/OTS 531; ed. Day; London: T&T Clark, 2010], p. 206). However, Schulz-Rauch has argued for 2.23 that "der Begriff בעלים ist . . . ein 'Platzhalter' mit pejorativen Konnotationen für diejenigen 'fremden Gottheiten,' denen Israel in seinen Gottesdiensten hinterherläuft"; *Hosea*, p. 55. In the plural form, בעל is used generically for other gods, for instance, also in Jdg 2.11; 3.7; 10.6; 1 Sam 12.10; 1 Kgs 18.18; Jer 9.13; Hos 2.15, 19; 11.2 (with פסלים).

205. Cf. Weiser: "Es wirft ein bezeichnendes Licht auf die Entartung des Gottesvolks, daß es, obwohl es schuldbefleckt 'vor Gottes Angesicht' steht, seine Unschuld mit einer glatten Lüge zu bekennen wagt"; pp. 26-27.

Similar to 2.20, the inset contains no pronominal or deictic referral to him but revolves entirely around her (נְטַמְאָתִי/הֶלְכָתִי). By the overt magnitude of the framing disproportion, her words in 2.23 thus affirm her characterization as an inaccessible communication partner and expose the depth of her self-absorption and detachment from YHWH.

The disconnection that emerges from these frame-inset dynamics in 2.23a leaves no doubt that YHWH's communicative strategies of 2.20-22 have failed. Far from recognition, let alone from repentance, Jerusalem has doubled her efforts to consolidate her position (אֵל appears twice). This stern reinforcement noticeably changes the way in which YHWH addresses her. While it is striking that there is any further address at all after the revealing and resistant quotation of 2.23aα, it is noteworthy that YHWH no longer makes any references to himself in 2.23aβ-25 (cf. שָׁבִיָּה, v. 20; נְטַמְאָתִי, v. 21; לִפְנֵי, v. 22). The focus of the discourse shifts entirely to Jerusalem and YHWH, shocked and frustrated by her words, recedes into the background. If she will not acknowledge his gifts of freedom and life, and if not even the fateful pronouncement of 2.22 can elicit an appropriate response, there is no hope to pursue her by means of yet another account of his benevolence. The speech quotation in 2.23a is thus framed as a pivotal element, both affirming the portrayal of Jerusalem in 2.20-22 and justifying and preparing YHWH's turn to a more forceful and provocative communicative strategy.

### **3.2.2. Imperatives and Metaphors (2.23aβ-25a)**

This shift immediately becomes apparent by the use of imperatives in 2.23aβ-25 of which there were none in 2.20-22. As in 2.19, the double-command רָאִי/דַעִי reflects YHWH's frustration; here, however, it is not with respect to Jerusalem's withdrawal but to her words. At the same time, the imperatives point the intractable city to a graphic challenge against her self-declared purity: look at

your way in the valley, consider what you have done!<sup>206</sup> While the location and events associated with this valley remain unspecified, YHWH's charge leads directly to the animal metaphors in 2.23b-24 which are introduced as an extrapolation of Jerusalem's way and deeds.<sup>207</sup> As shown in the layout of 2.23-25 above, this metaphorical account occupies the central position in the concentric arrangement of the unit; it is the nucleus to which the imperatives point and from which the quotations receive their perspective and function.<sup>208</sup> The distinct nature of the imagery is also reflected by its communication structure.

Contrasting the other material in 2.14-25, YHWH's speech in 2.23b-24 is not phrased as a direct address ("you are a camel"), but instead in referential language.<sup>209</sup> This variation highlights the central role of the metaphor, but it also affirms the change in YHWH's verbal strategy to which we have referred. Since his previous, direct engagement has had no effect, the referential, evocative account of camel and ass serves as an indirect object lesson, as a mirror held up before Jerusalem's face.

---

206. Cf. Volz: "Dem trotzigen Leugnen gegenüber weist Jeremia auf die stärksten Auswüchse hin"; p. 26.

207. Cf. Foreman, *Animal*: "The two animal metaphors occur in apposition to this statement [i.e., v. 23aβ] and thus help to illustrate the phrase"; p. 152. In Foreman's view, 2.23 relates to the Valley of Ben Hinnom (cf. נַחַל in 7.32 and 19.6) and "to literal acts of Baal worship"; pp. 152-156. While some exegetes share this view (e.g., Giesebrecht, p. 11; Condamin, p. 17; Hitzig, p. 17; Rudolph, p. 17; Fischer, p. 168), others remain doubtful in this regard (e.g., Duhm, p. 26; Carroll: "Non-specific reference"; p. 133; McKane, p. 43) or suggest alternatives, such as the valley at Bet Pegor; cf. Böhrer, "Geschlechterdifferenz," pp. 113-114; so already Targum and Rashi, *Miqra'ot*, p. 12. The exact nature of *what* was practiced in the valley remains unclear (cf. Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*, pp. 43-44). The scholarly suggestions include Baal worship, child sacrifice for Molech, cultic prostitution, and a cult for the dead (cf. Jer-LXX: πολυανδρείω = graveyard).

208. These dynamics in 2.23-25 are well-captured by Ortlund, *Wife*, p. 86.

209. As Glanz has demonstrated, such shifts in Jeremiah are frequently triggered by imperatives (see, e.g., 4.11-14; 18.18-21; 31.7); cf. *Shifts*, pp. 304-306. For de Regt, the shift in 2.24 "may be caused by figurative language"; "Person Shift in Prophetic Texts: Its Function and its Rendering in Ancient and Modern Translations," in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (OTW 45; ed. J. C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill), p. 230.

According to Foreman's analysis, the imagery "is *theological*, and not moral or political" like some of Jeremiah's other animal metaphors.<sup>210</sup> Yet, paralleling the use of דָּרַךְ in 2.18 (see discussion above) and 2.33, the camel's "chasing to and fro on her ways" (מְשַׁרְכֶּת דְּרָכֶיהָ) might also have political overtones.<sup>211</sup> In conjunction with the religious reference to the Baalim in 2.23aα, the metaphor would thus reintroduce the notion of Jerusalem's indiscriminate service that was exposed in 2.20. The city, implicitly compared to the swift camel, runs after anyone who comes her way, be that nations or gods.<sup>212</sup> Her uncontrollable behaviour is expressed more explicitly in the befitting description of the ass in heat. As the wild and overt sexual dimensions of this metaphor strike quite a different tone than the domestic images of yoke, plant, and soap, it underlines once more the change in YHWH's communicative strategy. Rather than pointing Jerusalem directly to her failures, the evocative image allows for an indirect portrayal of her driven and debased conduct.

Prompted by the imperatives in 2.23aβ, it would be difficult for her not to draw a connection between the ways of the animals and her own ways. If this strategy was successful, she would come to see her behaviour as habitual and shameful.<sup>213</sup> Moreover, it would open her eyes to her vulnerability to abusive partners (כָּל־מְבַקְשֶׁיהָ . . . יִמְצְאוּנָהּ). Bringing her face to face with her irrational character might also bring her to her senses regarding her self-defeated

---

210. *Animal*, p. 160 (emphasis original). Foreman follows here Brueggemann (pp. 39-40).

211. See in this regard especially Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 69-71. Liwak points out that זָרִים in 2.25, which harkens back to 2.23b-24, "auch ethnisch-politische Bezüge enthalten kann," and identifies in 2.23-25 a "Konnex zwischen Politik und Religion"; *Geschichte*, pp. 175-176.

212. Cf. Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*: "Judah is portrayed as insatiable in her desire to make alliances with other nations and gods, appearing all but indifferent to her partners' identity"; p. 102.

213. Cf. Wischnowsky, *Zion*: "In der Anwendung solcher sexuellen Metaphorik auf die Stadt wird diese als 'Triebtäterin' entwürdigt"; p. 145. See also Johanna Stiebert, *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible: The Prophetic Contribution* (JSOTSup 346; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 118-124.

declaration of freedom (cf. v. 20) and the extent to which her breakaway from YHWH cannot be turned back (מִי יִשְׁבְּנָה, v. 22).<sup>214</sup> Rather than interpreting the animal metaphors all too quickly as a reference to YHWH's adulterous wife,<sup>215</sup> the description of camel and ass must be appreciated first and foremost as an indirect exposition of Jerusalem's irrational, untameable, and self-destructive behaviour.

Whereas the two imperatives in 2.23aβ have drawn the city's attention to YHWH's zoological object lesson, the direct charge in 2.25a (מִנְעִי) now urges her to act in light of what she has observed.<sup>216</sup> Rather than as an "Act religiöser Kasteiung" or as an ironic aside to some other addressee, the appeal to Jerusalem to save herself from worn out feet and thirst relates more plausibly to the running desert-animals.<sup>217</sup> To protect her from the dangers of her unrestrained accessibility, the imperative in 2.25a constitutes YHWH's final attempt in this unit to convince Jerusalem that all her twisting, striving, and

---

214. Cf. Weiser: "Das Volk, das Jahwe nicht 'dienen' will (V. 20), ist zum Sklaven seiner ungezügelten Sinnlichkeit geworden"; p. 27.

215. So, e.g., Rom-Shiloni, "How can you say," p. 767; Diamond and O'Connor, "Passion": "A series of animal metaphors accuse her of adultery"; p. 130. There is no reference to 2.23 in Abma, *Marriage*, or Sienstra, *Husband* (cf. pp. 163-164).

216. Jer-LXX represents the imperative in 2.25a just as Jer-MT in direct address (ἀπόστρεψον τὸν πόδα σου), yet the speech quotation is rendered along with 2.23b-24 as a 3ms-account (ἡ δὲ εἶπεν). Finsterbusch is correct that the Greek version of 2.23b-25 offers "eine Reflexion über das Verhalten dieses Du," but overlooks the direct appeal in 2.25a; "Kommunikationsebenen," p. 259 (emphasis original).

217. Hitzig envisions ritual clamour ("unablässig mit lauter Stimme"; p. 18) which dries the throat. Lundbom (p. 282) sees in 2.25a a prophetic discouragement "aimed at those who are in search of the 'valley trekkers'" in order to return them to the good way. But already Rashi links 2.25a to the "פרא האוהב לנוע" (*Miqra'ot*, p. 14) and Bailey and Holladay support this connection by relating רגלך (v. 25a) to דרכך (v. 23aβ) and דרכיה (v. 23b); cf. "Jer. II 23-25," p. 260; so also Cornill (p. 25), Giesebrecht (p. 11), and McKane (p. 46). While Callum Carmichael understands רגל as a euphemism for genitals, Carroll has rightly stated that "euphemistic terms would be out of place" alongside the explicit language in 2.23b-24; cf. "A Ceremonial Crux: Removing a Man's Sandal as a Female Gesture of Contempt," *JBL* 96 (1977): 329; Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (London: SCM Press, 1981), p. 296.



chasing will ultimately lead to exhaustion and exploitation.<sup>218</sup> After this warning, the discourse turns to the third and final speech quotation in 2.20-25 (וְתִאמָרִי). As the structural counterpart to the inset in 2.23a, it marks the closing line of the unit and is fraught with the suspense about how Jerusalem will react to YHWH's metaphorical provocation and his urgent appeal.

### 3.2.3. "I love Strangers" (2.25b)

In marked distinction to the sequence of two "לֹא + verb" phrases in 2.23a, the inset of 2.25b opens with a compounded, double negation (לֹא + נוֹאֵשׁ). Alongside the substantival usage in Job 6.26 ("a despairing man"), the only other Niphal participles of נוֹאֵשׁ occur as interjections in prophetic speech quotations (cf. 18.12; Isa 57.10). Referencing the lust-driven animal, נוֹאֵשׁ is often understood as an expression of resignation ("it is hopeless"), that is, as an admission by Jerusalem to be addicted to her lovers; she can do nothing but chase after them.<sup>219</sup> Yet, in view of its conjunction with the emphatic לֹא, Jerusalem's contrary characterization throughout 2.20-25, and the comparison to its parallel in 18.12, it suits this passage much better to interpret נוֹאֵשׁ as a resistant and even hostile declaration.<sup>220</sup> With a single word, Jerusalem

---

218. The combination רָגַל + מָנַע occurs elsewhere only in Prov 1.15, urging the son not to follow in the way (אֶל־תֵּלֶךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ) of the luring sinners. To "walk barefoot" (יָחַר) appears only in contexts of lament (1 Sam 15.30) and destruction (Isa 20.2-4). Cf. Fischer: "Gott versucht, seine Angeredete zur Besinnung zu bringen"; p. 169.

219. Cf. Duhm: "Jer lässt das Weib nicht sagen, dass es nicht anders will, sondern dass es nicht anders kann"; p. 27. So, e.g., also McKane ("She is addicted to idolatry"; p. 56), Craigie (p. 38), Fretheim (pp. 69-70), Fischer (p. 169), Ortlund (*Wife*, p. 89), and Crenshaw who includes 2.25b under the headings "Despair" (cf. *Conflict*, p. 29). Overholt thinks that in this quotation "the people acknowledge the accuracy of the prophet's charge"; "Problem," p. 268; so also Allen (p. 49) and Thompson (p. 179).

220. So also Jer-LXX (Ἀνδρῶν). According to Holladay (p. 102), Rashi understood נוֹאֵשׁ as "an expression of contempt and indifference" (cf. *Miqra'ot*, p. 14). See further Calvin ("ferocity"; p. 122), Weiser ("Das 'Nein' des Ungehorsams"; p. 27), and Hardmeier ("Mit unbändigem Trotz"; "Redekomposition," p. 26); cf. *HALOT* ("Damn!"; 2:382), Hol ("To hell with it!"; p. 126). The parallel in 18.12 unmistakably portrays the speakers' resolution to cast YHWH's admonition (נוֹאֵשׁ כִּי־אֶחָרִי מִחֲשֹׁבוֹתַיִנִי יָלֵךְ; שׁוּבוּ נָא, v. 11) to the wind.

completely overthrows the hopes of YHWH's object lesson and his urgent, final appeal.

Far from resigning herself to her driven behaviour, the explosive opening of the inset denotes an outright and forceful rejection even to consider (cf. *דָּעִי*, v. 23aβ) what YHWH has to say, let alone follow his warnings. As in the previous quotations, this defiance is rooted in Jerusalem's egocentric perspective. Her speech makes no reference to YHWH's words and contains no pronominal or deictic marker that would identify it as a direct response. Instead, the inset is centered solely around her desires (*אֶהְבֶּתִי*) and her actions (*אֵלֶּךְ*). Despite all its variations and ambitions, YHWH's communicative and corrective initiative has been without success.

A notable development from the previous quotations is that the inset of 2.25b is much more explicit regarding Jerusalem's motives for her denials: she says "no!" to YHWH because she loves strangers (*כִּי־אֶהְבֶּתִי זָרִים*). While there appears to be a widespread agreement among interpreters that *זָרִים* refers here to other deities,<sup>221</sup> the term is used in Jeremiah only once in this way (cf. 3.13 with *תַּחַת כָּל־עֵץ רִעִין*; cf. 2.20b). All other occurrences refer to foreign people (5.19; 30.8; 51.2, 51) or non-personal objects (*מִים* in 18.14). Since we have already detected the merging of political and religious dimensions in 2.20 and 2.23b-24, and since *זָרִים* is used to denote both of these dimensions throughout the Hebrew Bible, we should be cautious of restricting the reference here only to other gods.<sup>222</sup> In keeping with the historical and referential vagueness that we

---

221. Rudolph sees the *זָרִים* in 2.25b as local cults of Baals and numina (p. 17). So, e.g., also Wolff ("Zitat," p. 46), Duhm (p. 27), Lundbom (p. 284), Wanke (pp. 41-42), Craigie (p. 38). The most thoroughly argued support for this interpretation is found in Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*, pp. 49-52. Cf. "foreign gods" in TNIV; CEB; NET.

222. For other gods, see, e.g., Deut 32.16; Isa 43.12; Ps 44.21. For foreigners, see, e.g., Deut 25.5; Isa 1.7; Ps 54.5; Prov 5.10; Job 15.19. As an attempt to resolve the contradiction between 2.23aα and 2.25b, Biddle argues that *זָרִים* refers exclusively to other nations; cf.

have witnessed thus far in 2.20-25, the words that are attributed to Jerusalem show that this unit is concerned primarily with the interaction between YHWH and the city.

In the parallel portrayal of the character, speech, and actions of these two entities, the inset's juxtaposition of invective (נוֹאֵשׁ לוֹא) speech towards YHWH with intimate (אֶהְבֵּתִי) and indiscriminate (זָרִים) speech towards her new lords is revelatory. Jerusalem refuses YHWH not because she loves this other god or that particular nation more; far from it, her commitment and devotion is directed at everyone. Considering this disposition, her default and almost frantic dismissal of YHWH, the author of her freedom and life, is utterly inexplicable. She loves everyone *but* YHWH.

Framed by his continued engagement across 2.23-25 and especially by the well-intended warning in 2.25a, her vehement rejection serves to show just how absurd her interaction with YHWH has become.<sup>223</sup> Closing this particular section, the speech quotation demonstrates the accuracy of Jerusalem's irrational characterization. At the same time, it reveals that there is, in fact, one deep-seated impulse that lends coherence to her words and actions, namely, her determination to speak, love, and live with no reference to YHWH whatsoever. This ludicrous resolve is appropriately assigned to the final position in the discourse (וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם אֵלֶּךְ).

---

*Redaction*, p. 53; cf. "foreigners" in ESV. Yet, alongside the references listed here, the twofold dimension of זָרִים in 2.25b is reflected already in the interpretation offered by Targum (לְעַמֵּי אֲרָם וְלְטַעֲוֵתָא) and is supported, e.g., also by Cornill (p. 25), Holladay (p. 102), and Liwak (cf. *Geschichte*, pp. 175-176); see further *NIDOTTE* 1:1142; *TLOT* 1:390-392. The lexeme אֶהְבֵּתִי likewise appears in 2.1-3.5 and the rest of Jeremiah in both religious and political contexts (cf. 2.2, 33; 8.2; 22.20-22; 30.14; 31.3).

223. Though restricted to the question of authenticity, Overholt makes an astute comment about the "lack of logical development of the ideas (loving *strangers*?)" in 2.25; "Problem," p. 270 (emphasis original).

### 3.2.4. Conclusion: The Dynamics of 2.23a $\alpha$ and 2.25b

By way of conclusion, we return now to our initial observation of the contradictory interrelationship between the insets of 2.23 and 2.25. As argued above, the tension between *לֹא הִלֵּכְתִּי* and *וְאֶתְּרִיָּהֶם אֵלַי* defies any convenient resolution and must be recognized as an integral component of this unit. Having now discussed the respective parts of the chiasm and especially the framing influence of the metaphors in 2.23b-24, what can we say about this particular arrangement of the two insets?

In the sequence of denial and declaration, our judgment that 2.23a articulates an outright lie is confirmed by Jerusalem's own speech. Moreover, the implicit, metaphorical portrayal of a character who totters to and fro is transposed to her communicative behaviour: she has no steady position but adheres now to this, now to that opinion. Her speech is just as incoherent as her commitment to freedom and just as indiscriminate as her coalitions with her new allies. Despite the extra effort to keep up a façade of innocence, she cannot control her tongue and, by blurting out her true desires and pursuits, ends up exposing herself.<sup>224</sup> The framing of the two insets against one another thus contributes significantly to the characterization of Jerusalem who contradicts not only YHWH's words but also her own.

By means of their respective frames and in juxtaposition to 2.20-22 and to one another, the speech quotations in 2.23-25 leave no doubt that YHWH's change of rhetorical strategy—the graphic object lesson and his direct appeals—have not brought about the intended response. Jerusalem's quoted words in

---

224. Pace Brueggemann: "Everything Judah says is false"; p. 36. The quotation in 2.25b fits well under Wolff's discussion of quotes of clarification: "Eine andere Art von Verdeutlichung der Rede ist es, wenn die *Worte der Herzen* vom Propheten als Worte der Lippen zitiert werden. Das *Verborgene* wird *ans Licht gerückt*, die Gesinnung wird offenbar"; "Zitat," p. 81 (emphasis original).

2.23-25 are just as disconnected from him and his words as the inset in 2.20-22. Instead of articulating repentance, the magnitude of the lie in 2.23 and especially the quotation in 2.25b manifest the full extent of her aversion to YHWH. Inaccessible to his varied address, YHWH cannot penetrate past the wall of the self-absorption which prevents her from perceiving her current situation.

Inasmuch as she dismisses YHWH's direct charges and the elaborate object lesson set before her, she likewise refuses to learn from the lessons of history (cf. vv. 14-19). Although Israel's ways (הלך, vv. 5b, 8b, 13b) have led to destruction, she will not stop walking away from YHWH (הלך + דרך, vv. 17-18) in order to continue her indiscriminate pursuits (משׁרֶכֶת דִּרְכֶיהָ, v. 23b). Reminiscent of the people's behaviour in 2.4-13, this determination to wander after unknown and potentially harmful alternatives (וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם אֵלֶךְ, v. 25b) is grounded in an inexplicable dismissal of YHWH's sure guidance and nourishment.

#### **4. Quotation as Structure and Dialogue? An Integrated Reading of 2.20-25**

Having analyzed the three quotations within their frames, we are now in a position to draw some conclusions regarding their interrelationship and function in the discourse of 2.20-25 as a whole. The abrupt succession of images, exclamations, and imperatives that unfolds in this unit demands a careful, line-by-line approach to its arrangement and argument. As a result of the metaphorical indirections and the unspecified nature of past bonds, current gods, unnamed valleys, and beloved strangers, the passage provides few, if any, points of orientation. It is possibly for this reason and also for their conspicuous placement, that some interpreters have assigned to the speech quotations a structuring role throughout 2.20-25. While we have already seen proposals of this kind in our review of Herrmann's redaction and Biddle's posit of an original וְתִאֲמַר-refrain, the organizational significance of the quotations has also been

suggested in a number of other studies.<sup>225</sup>

In light of our analysis, however, such an understanding ascribes too much autonomy to the quotations and pays too little attention to their contextual integration. After all, what is placed at the head of 2.20-25 is not a quoted inset, but the governing perspective of YHWH as deliverer and, via subsequent reinforcement, as life-giver of Jerusalem. Placed inseparably within the structure of 2.20, her speech quotation is but a brief and subordinate element—the word ratio is two to sixteen—which is framed solely to elevate YHWH’s caring character and to portray her as incoherent and inaccessible. Likewise, the organizing principle in 2.23-25 is not the quotations, but the animal metaphor which is identified as such by its length, placement, and referential style. The insets’ parallelism in the chiasm and the conceptual tension of their expressions does not organize this section but stands entirely in the service of YHWH’s implicit comparison between Jerusalem and the animals. The supportive function of the quotations is evident also in Jerusalem’s self-confessed devotion to the זרים in 2.25b which provides conclusive confirmation of the frame’s amalgamation of her political and religious servitude (cf. vv. 20, 23b-24).

From beginning to end, it is not the quotations that structure the unit, but rather, it is the frame’s diverse and intertwined building blocks which amass, clause by clause, a rich portrayal of Jerusalem’s absurd behaviour. In the midst of this turbulent compilation—which is appropriately reflective of the city’s character—the three quotations are but one element among many and

---

225. Böhler, for instance, states that the quotes in 2.20-25 are “strukturtragend”; “Geschlechtsdifferenz,” p. 97. Cf. Craigie: “The structure of the passage as a whole is dominated by the quoted words”; p. 36. Similar also Lundbom (pp. 275-276) and Schulz-Rauch (cf. *Hosea*, pp. 33-37).

contribute in their unique capacities to the communicative agenda of YHWH's exposing and evocative address.

Closely related to their supposed structuring significance is the idea that the quotations portray a dialogue between YHWH and Jerusalem.<sup>226</sup> Yet, while they are firmly integrated within the poetic structure of 2.20 and the chiasm of 2.23-25, Jerusalem's quoted speech was characterized above all by its disconnectedness from YHWH's words. None of the three quotations is identified through pronominal or deictic markers as a direct address, let alone as an appropriate response. Jerusalem's absent acknowledgment of his deliverance (v. 20), the magnitude of her communicative detachment (v. 23), and the fervent rejection of his efforts (v. 25) all emphasize that she either speaks past YHWH, against YHWH, or simply with no reference at all to YHWH. Through the unit, Jerusalem speaks only with regard to herself, her deeds, her ambitions, her preferences. Expressing this egocentricity, her mechanical, negative statements are framed as alien elements within YHWH's engaging address. He speaks to her, seeks to persuade her, tries now this and now that rhetorical strategy, yet not one single word breaks through her self-absorption and aloofness.

Rather than a dialogue in which two conversation partners converse back and forth, the speech patterns of YHWH and city oppose one another. Although YHWH begins with an affirmative, self-referential account, the focus of his address is drastically altered by the blatant lie in 2.23a after which his verbal arsenal shifts from gracious deeds to sharp imperatives and from domestic images to wild metaphors. This frustrated withdrawal manifests itself fully in the final quotation in 2.25b which, in marked contrast to the first two quotations, lacks a divine response. Juxtaposed with this receding speech

---

226. So, e.g., Fretheim, pp. 74-75; Carroll, p. 132.

pattern, the development of Jerusalem's words are depicted as a continual upsurge. What begins in 2.20 with a two-word inset of one brief negative statement (לֹא) develops to an extended, increased denial in 2.23 (לֹא נִטְמָאֲתִי/לֹא הִלְכָּתִי) and grows yet more forceful in the fronted rejection of 2.25 (נִוָּאֵשׁ לֹא).<sup>227</sup> Hence, the verbal interaction between YHWH and city is not only disconnected but, in fact, adverse. The more he speaks to her, the more she speaks past him; the more he exposes her failures, the more she turns against him; the more he shows signs of resignation, the more relentless becomes her self-affirmation.

In its framed opposition to YHWH's verbal efforts, the intensified self-focus of the quotations shows that all his attempts to bring Jerusalem to her senses are without success, and even worse, that they solidify her defiance. The self-contradiction that is created by the insets of 2.23-25 indicates that YHWH's words have brought about not a realization of her current state, but a reinforcement of it. This inverted relationship between effort and result absolves YHWH from the accusation of not having invested enough resources towards saving the city. His portrayal as redeemer and life-giver is also vindicated by Jerusalem's impenetrable self-absorption. He has set her free (2.20), has given her life (2.21), and has warned her of the peril of her ways (2.24); yet with the word that brings the discourse to its bleak conclusion, she defies all of this and pronounces her determination to walk only where, how, and with whom she wants (וְלִי, v. 25b).

---

227. Schulz-Rauch draws attention to the formal uniqueness of the final formulation ("nur in V25b wird לֹא absolut gebraucht") and identifies it appropriately as "den Höhepunkt der Argumentation"; *Hosea*, p. 36. Schmidt sees in the quotes in 2.20-25 "eine zusammenhängende Folge mit der Tendenz zur Steigerung"; p. 90. These opposing development are reflected also in the word-count proportions between the insets and their respective verses: while YHWH dominates the discourse in 2.20 (16:2), the shift that is notable in 2.23 (12:6) becomes fully apparent in 2.25 (6:6).



## 5. Conclusion

Our analysis of 2.20-25 substantially affirms the central argument of this study, namely, that the interpretation of prophetic speech quotations cannot be conducted without astute attention to their contexts. Regarding the question of integration, our discussion of 2.20 has demonstrated the extent to which the inset forms an intrinsic part of the poetic configuration of the verse. Likewise, the verbal parallels between 2.23 and 2.25 and the structural relationship of these insets within the unit's chiasm underline our contention that quoted phrases cannot be separated from their complex, contextual relations. This conclusion has further been substantiated by the interconnected phrasing and perspective of the three quotations across 2.20-25. Isolated and forced into simplistic categories, the unity between inset and frame is destroyed and it is impossible to detect the deliberate relationships and rich rhetorical contributions of this sequence of attributed utterances.

Discussing these insets in their frames, we saw at work the communicative subordination and the contextual shaping of quoted words that we had introduced via Sternberg's theory in chapter two. Placed between the account of YHWH as liberator and YHWH as life-giver, the ungrateful and self-absorbed quality of Jerusalem's words in 2.20 was magnified. The subsequent charges of the wild vine and useless soap developed her negative characterization further and the declaration of innocence in 2.23—while on its own terms laudable—is transformed to an incriminating lie by means of its contextual friction with 2.25b. The quoted speaker has remained the same throughout this unit (cf. the fathers and the priests in 2.4-9) and the framing of two insets has been employed not to demonstrate continuity, but contradiction.

In this unique capacity of attribution, indirection, and communicative creativity, the quotations have made a substantial contribution to the portrayal of Jerusalem. As noted in chapter two, Hebrew narrative critics have shown that

words and conversations are often the prime component in the shaping of characters. Within the frame of 2.20-22, Jerusalem's brief denial exhibits various negative traits, such as her lacking acknowledgment of YHWH's gifts, her indiscriminate behaviour, and her self-centred and self-destructive determination. The insets in 2.23-25 elaborate on this portrayal by showing her to be unstoppable in her pursuits, inaccessible to YHWH's warnings, and self-contradictory in her words. Across the unit, her consistent self-focus, the detachment from YHWH's words, and her ever-increasing assertiveness and aggression has further exposed her corrupted personality. Her indiscriminate devotion and ignorance comes to light in the interplay between her words (service to nobody) and her actions (service to everybody). These combinations of description and demonstration affirm YHWH's allegations and create a holistic image of Jerusalem's character.

In the first substantial section in 2.1-3.5 that is devoted to the city, the phrasing, placement, interrelationship, and framing of the quotations is thus utilized to introduce Jerusalem and to expose the depth of her corruption and the true extent of her aversion to YHWH. Far from merely posing an antithesis to his disputations, the quotations show a whole range of the city's attributes. Her verbal contradictions, once unshackled from convenient reconstructions or alleged referential claims, provide a powerful demonstration of her incomprehensible ways. In the frame of YHWH's saving and speaking initiative, Jerusalem is stripped of all excuses for scorning her life-giver. Despite his foundational gifts and well-intended warnings, she refuses to enter into dialogue with him; in fact, the more he pursues her and tries to open her eyes to her dangerous ways, the more her opposition comes to the surface. As the counterpart to the rhetorical foil that was set up in 2.1-3, the quotations in

2.20-25 depict Jerusalem as having entirely abandoned her devotion to YHWH.

By exposing these depth-dimensions of her character and the impossibility of any change on her part, the quotations spell out in detail Jerusalem's lost fear for YHWH (לֹא פִתְּחָהּי אֶל־יְיָ, v. 19b) and offer an explanation for her failure to learn from Israel's history (cf. vv. 14-19). In her present state of mind and her absurd attitude towards YHWH, the looming judgment cannot be averted. Conversely, the quotations serve to absolve YHWH from any responsibility for her coming collapse. As her redeemer and life-giver, he has tried his best to bring her to her senses. But in the end, she chooses to go her own way. The harsh quotation in 2.25b brought an end to YHWH's address to Jerusalem and the discourse in the next unit turns back to Judah (cf. v. 28b). If the city will not respond to YHWH's warnings and learn from the metaphorical and historical object lessons set before her, perhaps the people will be more receptive.

## Chapter Six - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.26-32

- 2.26 כְּבִשְׁת גָּנָב כִּי יִמָּצָא      Like the shame of a thief when he is found  
בֵּן הַבֵּישׁוֹ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל      thus the House of Israel was put to shame.  
הֵמָּה מְלָכֵיהֶם שָׂרֵיהֶם      They, their kings, their nobles,  
וְכֹהֲנֵיהֶם וְנְבִיאֵיהֶם      and their priests and their prophets  
2.27 אֹמְרִים לָעֵץ אָבִי אַתָּה      were saying to a tree: "My father you are!"  
וְלָאֶבֶן אַתָּה יִלְדָתִנִּי      and to a stone: "You gave me birth!"  
כִּי־פָנּוּ אֵלַי עֵרָף      For they turned to me the nape of the neck  
וְלֹא פָנִים      instead of the face  
וּבְעֵת רָעָתָם יֹאמְרוּ      but in the time of their trouble they would say:  
קוּמָה וְהוֹשִׁיעֵנו      "Rise and save us!"  
2.28 וְאַיֵּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ      So where are your gods  
אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ לָךְ      that you made for yourself?  
יָקוּמוּ      Let them rise up,  
אִם־יוֹשִׁיעוּדָךְ בְּעֵת רָעָתְךָ      let them save you in the time of your trouble!  
כִּי מִסְפַּר עָרֶיךָ      Surely, as numerous as your cities,  
הֵיוּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְהוּדָה      so are your gods, O Judah.  
2.29 לָמָּה תִּרְיְבוּ אֵלַי      Why do you contend with me?  
כָּלְכֶם פָּשַׁעְתֶּם בִּי      All of you have transgressed against me  
נֹאֵם־יְהוָה      —Speech of YHWH—  
2.30 לְשׁוֹן הַכִּיתִי אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם      In vain I struck your children,  
מוֹסֵר לֹא לָקַחוּ      correction they did not take.  
אֲכָלָה חֶרֶבְכֶם נְבִיאֵיכֶם      Your sword has devoured your prophets  
כְּאַרְיֵה מִשְׁחִית      like a destroying lion.  
2.31 הַדּוֹר אַתֶּם      O generation, you,  
רְאוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה      consider the word of YHWH:  
הֲמִדְבַּר הָיִיתִי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל      Have I been a wilderness to Israel,  
אִם אֶרֶץ מְאֻפְלָה      or a land of darkness?  
מִדּוּעַ אָמְרוּ עַמִּי      Why have my people said:  
רָדְנוּ      "We have gone our own way,  
לֹא־נָבֹא עוֹד אֵלֶיךָ      we will not come again to you?"  
2.32 הֲתִשְׁכַּח בְּתוּלָה עֲדִיָּה      Does a maiden neglect her jewelry,  
כָּלָה קִשְׁרֶיהָ      or a bride her ribbons?  
וְעַמִּי שָׁכַחוּנִי      Yet, my people have neglected me,  
יָמִים אֵין מִסְפָּר      days without number.

## 1. Introduction

Thematically, 2.26-32 corresponds in many ways to 2.4-13.<sup>1</sup> Again the discourse revolves around allegiance to other deities (vv. 5, 8, 11, 13, 27), accusations of abandonment (רחק, v. 5; פנו, v. 27; שכח, v. 32), and the contentions between YHWH and his people that emerge from these dynamics (ריב, vv. 9, 29). The reoccurrence of the wilderness (מדבר, vv. 6, 31) and of Judah's children (בניכם, vv. 9, 29) and leaders (vv. 8, 26b) is also noteworthy. As intimated in chapter three, the similarities between the two passages extend to their respective communication structures.<sup>2</sup> The discourse of 2.26-32 addresses Judah, who is explicitly named in 2.28, alongside the 3mp-referent Israel (vv. 26, 31). Similar to 2.4-9 and Jerusalem's object lesson in the previous unit, YHWH's address is once more set against the background of the nation Israel as a whole.

According to our text analysis, the unit is divided along the central announcement in 2.29 into two parallel sections which both frame one or more insets in their medial position:

	2.26-28	2.30-32
simile	כְּבִשֶׁת (v. 26)	כְּאֶרְיָה (v. 30)
quotation	אֹמְרִים/יֹאמְרוּ (v. 27)	אֹמְרוּ (v. 31)
question & number	וְאֵיהָ (v. 28a)	הֶתְשַׁכַּח (v. 32a)
	מִסְפָּר (v. 28b)	מִסְפָּר (v. 32b)

This configuration demands that we begin our analysis by examining the framing perspective that sets the scene for each quotation (i.e., vv. 26, 29-30). We will then probe the phrasing and integration of the insets with regard to this perspective and ask in closing how these observations relate to the questions

---

1. For an extensive list of verbal and thematic links, see Biddle, *Redaction*, pp. 129-130.

2. Cf. Finsterbusch, "Kommunikationsebenen": "Dies alles [i.e., the parallels between 2.4-5 and 2.31] spricht für eine intentionale parallele rhetorische Gestaltung der Redegänge durch die Verfasser und Redaktoren. Entsprechend parallel sind die Kommunikationsebenen aufzufassen"; p. 254.

that follow. While the communication structures between addressee Judah and referent Israel will be taken into account throughout this analysis, a full discussion of these dynamics is reserved for the integrated reading of 2.26-32 that succeeds the treatments of the two sections.

## 2. Frame and Insets in 2.26-28

Among the other quotations in 2.1-3.5 and the rest of Jeremiah, the occurrence of three independent insets within one verse presents us with a unique case of frame-inset dynamics.<sup>3</sup> The configuration of this triplet is markedly different than the interrelationships of the quotations in the previous units. Instead of articulating an interplay between full and abbreviated insets (2.4-9) or a growing sequence (2.20-25), all three quotations in 2.27 consist of a two-word structure, creating a quick progression of staccato exclamations across the verse:

אָבִי אַתָּה	“My father you are!”
אַתָּה יָלַדְתָּנִי	“You gave me birth!”
קוּמָה וְהוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ	“Rise and save us!”

Before we embark on examining these brief formulations, the position of 2.27 as the medial component in 2.26-28 and the *verbum dicendi* of the first two insets (אָמְרִים) demands that we turn our attention first to 2.26. Due to the non-referential nature of the participial marking, our first question concerns the identity of the quoted speaker. More so than in the previous quotations, the *verbum dicendi* in 2.27 highlights the need for attending to the frame. As mentioned above, the referential, third-person account that fronts this unit (cf.

---

3. The two insets in 2.27a share the *verbum dicendi* אָמְרִים, but are identified as independent phrases by their distinctive addressees (לְעַץ/וּלְאֶבֶן) and gender markers (אַתָּה/אַתָּה).

(הַבִּישׁוּ, הַמָּה) provides a comparative background for YHWH's address to Judah. The quoted words and the actions described in 2.26-27 are attributed to the nation Israel.

## 2.1. Crime and Shame (2.26)

In addition to identifying the quoted speaker, the discourse of 2.26 also determines the perspective that frames the three insets in the following verse. Contrasting the focus on YHWH's character and deeds that had fronted 2.4-9 and 2.20-25, the present unit opens with an image of a caught and shamed thief (כָּבֶשֶׁת גָּנֵב כִּי יִמָּצֵא) which is introduced as a mirror showing the shame that Israel has faced in the past (הַבִּישׁוּ). In comparison with the public atrocities of 2.20b, Stiebert has suggested that the emphasis of 2.26 lies on the "thief's *covert* activity."<sup>4</sup> Theft and secrecy are obviously related, yet the simile arguably focuses more on what is revealed (כִּי יִמָּצֵא) than on what is concealed.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, since the details of the crime remain unspecified, the act of stealing itself moves into the background. At the head of 2.26-28 thus stands the indirect characterization of Israel as a guilty criminal and the depiction of the shameful discovery of the people's crimes.<sup>6</sup>

Some interpreters understand the cause of this shame in relation to

---

4. Cf. *Shame*, p. 121 (emphasis original).

5. As Stephen Dempster has argued, "the verb *mš'*, particularly in the N stem, is a *terminus technicus* in juridical contexts for the discovery of evidence of crime"; "The Deuteronomic Formula *KĪ YIMMĀṢĒ* in the Light of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Law: An Evaluation of David Daube's Theory," *RB* 91 (1984): 198.

6. This focus becomes apparent also in comparison with Exod 22.1-2 (יִמָּצֵא הַגָּנֵב) which provides the background for this verse (cf. Fischer, p. 170; Holladay, p. 103). According to Fishbane, the stylistic alterations between the two texts affect a shift "from the specific acts of a burglar to the delicts of all Israel"; *Interpretation*, p. 313. In this adaptation, the consequence of Israel's crime has shifted from death or slavery (וְנִמְכָּר בְּגִנְבָתוֹ, Exod 22.2b) to being shamed (כִּי יִמָּצֵא, הַבִּישׁוּ); for a helpful discussion for the dynamics of the law in Exod 22.1-2, see esp. William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19-40* (AB 2A; New York: Doubleday, 2006), pp. 239-242.

Israel's actions,<sup>7</sup> yet others connect it to the disgrace of public exposure.<sup>8</sup> While both suggestions are appropriate with respect to the *thief*, 2.26a does not provide precise information with respect to *Israel*: what exactly did the people try to steal, how were they discovered, and what was shameful about all of this? What introduces this unit, then, is not an accusation regarding a specific event or act,<sup>9</sup> but an *a priori* characterization of Israel as criminal and shameful. The justification and contours of this portrayal, which in view of 2.26b includes plebs as much as politicians, priests, and prophets,<sup>10</sup> is not explicitly articulated until the following verse.

## 2.2. The Triplet of Insets in 2.27

Scholars have generally been concerned not so much with the two quotations in 2.27a *per se*, but rather with their recipients (וְלִאֲבוֹן/לְעַץ).<sup>11</sup> Whereas the couplet

---

7. So, e.g., Brueggemann (p. 38) and Fretheim: "They will be shown to have acted shamefully when, it is assumed, they are caught"; p. 69.

8. Cf. Volz: "אֲבוֹן drückt nicht die innere Scham oder Reue, sondern die Blamage, den Schaden aus"; p. 28. So also Lundbom ("public humiliation"; p. 284), Schmidt (p. 91), and McKane (p. 48).

9. Cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Der bleibt Text zunächst im Unverbindlichen"; p. 176.

10. The particular combination of leaders in 2.26b occurs only three more times in Jeremiah (cf. 4.9; 8.1; 32.32) and the pronoun הָמָּה occurs in lists only here and in 32.32. Far from being a mere connecting element (so, e.g., McKane, p. 47), Tiemeyer has made a good case to regard the pronoun as a reference to the people (cf. "Priests," pp. 244-245; see also Holladay: "The pronoun by exclusion must be taken to mean 'the people in general'"; p. 103). The list in 2.26b, then, does not assign prime responsibility to the leaders as that of 2.8 (*pace* Carroll, p. 135; Lundbom, p. 284) but declares all of Israel as guilty. Many scholars delete 2.26b and obliterate this nuance on the grounds that the list interrupts an original connection between בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל and אֲמָרִים; so, e.g., Volz (p. 48), Giesebrecht (p. 12), Weiser (p. 19), Rudolph (p. 16), McKane (p. 48); Thiel, *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), p. 83. If this decision is rooted in Duhm's questionable evaluation, it is worth reconsideration: "Die Strophe ist so überladen und das Metrum so völlig zerstört, . . . wer mit dem B. Jeremia näher bekannt ist, sieht sofort, dass die öde Aufzählung in v. 26b nicht von Jer, sondern von einem Bearbeiter herrührt"; p. 27.

11. The articular construction לְ + אֲבוֹן is unique. Although לְ + עֵץ appears twice more (Hab 2.19; Job 14.7), neither passage sheds light on this particular feature. This scenario would explain why Böckler can conclude that the articles denote a specific tree and a specific stone (cf. *Vater*, p. 301), whereas Holladay thinks it more plausible that they are general references ("any



of tree and stone is understood by many as manifestations of Canaanite nature religion in more general terms,<sup>12</sup> others have suggested that they denote veiled references to Asherah and Baal.<sup>13</sup> This latter proposal has had a significant influence on the interpretation of the quoted insets. After all, if the goddess Asherah is to be equated with the masculine noun אֵל, the appellation as father would be nonsensical and if Baal is seen to stand behind the feminine noun אֵלִים, the address as mother likewise is absurd. This inversion would reflect the prophet's ridicule of his audience whom he depicts as unaware of the identity of the objects of their veneration.<sup>14</sup>

While such a strategy would certainly not be out of place in the arena of prophetic polemics, the identification of the generic tree with Asherah is not convincing. Both entities are clearly differentiated in 17.2; moreover, אֵל appears in Jeremiah predominantly in stock phrases that denounce idolatry in indiscriminate terms.<sup>15</sup> Hence, the genders of the quoted appeals and their

---

at all"; p. 103; followed by Fischer, p. 170).

12. See, e.g., Duhm (p. 28), Rudolph (p. 17), McKane (p. 48), Craigie (p. 39).

13. See, e.g., Cornill, (p. 26), Lundbom (pp. 284-285), Fischer (p. 170), Wanke (p. 42). A different proposal comes from Saul M. Olyan, "The Cultic Confessions of Jer 2.27a," *ZAW* 99 (1987): 254-259. Since the epithet "Father" is nowhere attributed to Baal, Olyan asserts that the deities represented in 2.27a are Asherah (tree) and YHWH (stone). In view of biblical traditions which oppose stone symbols for YHWH (e.g., Deut 16.21-22; Hos 3.4), the verse presents "an example of inner-Jahwistic ideological conflict" (p. 259). Leaving aside the controversial, epigraphic evidence from Kuntilet 'Ajrûd which Olyan cites in support of his argument, 2.27a evidently does not condemn Israel for *illicit* worship of YHWH, but for not worshipping him at all (בְּיָדָיו אֵלִים עֲרֵךְ וְלֹא פָנִים). In line with other polemics against tree and stone (e.g., Deut 4.27-28; Isa 37.18-19; Jer 3.9; Ezek 20.32), the identity of these entities is less important than the infractions for which they stand; for further points of criticism, see Herrmann (pp. 147-148); Böckler, *Vater*, pp. 306-307. For references and discussion of the pair אֵלִים/אֵל, see N. Wyatt, *Word of Tree and Whisper of Stone: And Other Papers on Ugaritic Thought* (GUS 1; Piscataway, NJ: 2007), pp. 181-192.

14. Cf. Thompson: "Israel was confused about what she was worshipping"; pp. 179-180. So, e.g., Lundbom (pp. 284-285), Olyan, "Confessions" (p. 255), Lawrence Boadt, *Jeremiah 1-25* (OTMS 9; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982), p. 26. With reference to 2.26, Fischer sees this reversal at the root of Israel's shame ("die Menschen machen sich lächerlich"; p. 170).

15. Cf. 2.20; 3.6, 9, 13; 10.3, 8. See, e.g., also Isa 37.19; 44.19; Ezek 20.32. Cf. Schmidt: "Ob sie [i.e., Holz und Stein] mit Aschera (Kultpfahl?) und Massebe identifiziert werden können, bleibt unsicher, zumal dem 'Holz' die Vaterrolle zufällt. Götternamen werden hier nicht genannt"; p. 92. Holladay sums it up well: "A discussion of what kind of paganism is involved here is beside the mark; Jrm is mocking paganism in general"; p. 104.

addressees are not indicative of uninformed worship, but rather, they form a neatly parallel structure between masculine (עַץ/אֶתֶר) and feminine (אֶבֶן/אֶתֶר) elements.<sup>16</sup> In light of this arrangement and in conjunction with the intentional acts of theft (2.26a) and turning (2.27aβ), Israel's devotion to tree and stone is presented not as blind, but as determined and organized. Corresponding to other prophetic polemics (e.g., Isa 44.9-20; Jer 10.2-5), the interrelationship of the quoted insets in 2.27a demonstrates the absurd pursuit and praise of natural objects.

From these observations regarding the identity and interrelationship of the quotes' addressees, we turn now to their respective structures and content. Although YHWH is depicted across the Hebrew Bible far more often as a king than as a father,<sup>17</sup> the textual evidence suggests that he was venerated in this way. The relationship between YHWH and Israel is expressed in familial terms most often with the nouns אב and בן,<sup>18</sup> yet the verb ילד is also used once towards this end (צור ילדך, Deut 32.18).<sup>19</sup> Considering these passages and the common

---

16. Duhm (p. 28) emphasizes that the appeals as father and mother are related to the genders of the nouns עץ (masc.) and אבן (fem.). For gender-parallelism in Jeremiah and elsewhere, see Watson, "Symmetry of Stanza in Jeremiah 2.2b-3," *JSOT* 19 (1981): 107-10 (for עץ/אבן in v. 27a, see pp. 108-109); "Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in the OT," *JBL* 99 (1980): 321-41.

17. For instance, James L. Mays argues that the phrase "YHWH malak" provides the "organizational centre for the theology of the psalms"; "The Centre of the Psalms," in *Language, Theology, and the Bible*, p. 232. See also Shawn W. Flynn, *YHWH is King: The Development of Divine Kingship in Ancient Israel* (VTSup 159; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

18. While some of these references are restricted to royal figures (cf. 2 Sam 7.14; Ps 2.7; 89.27; 1 Chr 17.13; 22.10; 28.6;), אב/בן-language occurs in several passages with reference to YHWH and Israel (cf. Exod 4.22-23; Deut 1.31; 8.5; 32.6; Isa 63.16; 64.7; Jer 31.9, 20; Hos 11.1; Ps 103.13; Prov 3.12; 1 Chr 29.10; see also Ps 68.6: אֲבִי יְרוּשָׁלַם). For father (YHWH)/daughter (Jerusalem), see the discussion of 3.4 below. The lexeme אב occurs also as a theophoric element in personal names (cf. *DDD*, p. 327). For a full overview, see Böckler, *Vater*; Svetlana Knobnya, "God the Father in the Old Testament," *EJT* 20 (2011): 139-148; *TLOT* 1:1-13.

19. YHWH occurs as the subject of ילד only once more (ילדתך, Ps 2.7) and with reference to Israel's king; cf. *TLOT* 2:544-546; *NIDOTTE* 2:455. Fischer (p. 171) suggests that the image of YHWH as rock (צור) in Deut 32.4-18 provides a "Kontrasthintergrund für Israel's Hinwendung zum Stein" in Jer 2.27a. For מְחַלְלֵךְ, the verb parallel to ילדך in Deut 32.18, see Julia A. Foster, "The Motherhood of God: The Use of *hyl* as God-Language in the Hebrew Scriptures," in *Uncovering*

use of יֵלֵךְ in the Hebrew Bible, the insets in 2.27a portray their speakers as directing to their new lords of wood and stone the parental appellatives that were commonly ascribed to YHWH. It is important to note that the quoted words are not “heidnische Gebete” but genuine Israelite formulations.<sup>20</sup> They are legitimate on the lips of YHWH’s people—YHWH himself envisions the king calling out אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי to him (Ps 89.27)—but have been transformed to utterly inappropriate speech by virtue of the framed address to tree and stone. As previously the laudable statement in 2.23, these dynamics bear witness to the control that the quoting context asserts over the content and meaning of a quoted utterance. To recall Sternberg’s words, the frame reigns supreme.

Integrated within the complementary structure of masculine and feminine elements, the two insets demonstrate that the Israelites have ascribed their existence *in toto* to their idols and not to YHWH.<sup>21</sup> The polemic element in 2.27a, then, it is not the confusion of the worshippers, but their wholesale and deliberate transfer of the titles which properly belong to YHWH, their life-giver and father, to the life-less images of stone and wood. Moreover, the quotations express the commitment and passion that marks this absurd exchange (cf. v. 11). After all, the exclamation אֱלֹהֵי—here fronted for emphasis—is not solely a technical denominator for origins but also a relational and emotional expression.<sup>22</sup> Israel’s affection for their self-proclaimed new parents is also

---

*Ancient Stones: Essays in Memory of H. Neil Richardson* (ed. Lewis M. Hopfe; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), pp. 93-102. On the maternal description of YHWH in prophetic texts, see further Dille, *Mixing Metaphors*, pp. 35-40, 41-73, 128-151.

20. Wolff, “Zitat,” p. 82. Because of the attribution of pagan prayers to Israelite worshippers, Wolff concludes that the insets in 2.27a are fictitious (“höchst unwahrscheinlich”).

21. In some text, YHWH’s depiction as father is connected to creation and birth terms; see, e.g., Deut 32.6 (קִנְיָה; עֵשָׂה; בִּזּוֹן); Isa 64.7 (יֵצֵר; מַעֲשֵׂה); Jer 31.9 (בִּבְרִי). So also Böckler, *Vater*: “‘Vater’ ist hier eindeutig im Sinne des Schöpfers des Lebens verstanden”; p. 307.

22. Cf. Schmidt: “Vertrauensvolle Hinwendung”; p. 93. McKane states that Israel is “bound to the gods of Canaan in as compulsive and inescapable a way as children are bound to their parents”; p. 48.

apparent by the explicit marking of the quotations as *addressed* quotations (“to a tree/to a stone”)—contrasting the not-spoken insets in 2.4-9 and the detached insets in 2.20-25—and the switch from the plural *verbum dicendi* (אִמְרִים) to the personal phrasing of the insets in first person singular.

These observations relate in a number of significant ways to the framing perspective of 2.26. Far from being a secret act, Israel’s pursuit of tree and stone is exposed as an open and orderly undertaking in which leaders and people alike engage in outspoken, emphatic confessions. The focus of the fronted image rests on the uncovering of Israel’s crimes (כִּי יִמְצָא) and the phrasing and framing of the two insets shows for all to see that Israel has robbed YHWH of his rightful titles of father and creator. By speaking to tree and stone in these terms, his people have stolen his accomplishments and acclaim from him.

While the quoted words in 2.27a confirm the negative, *a priori* characterization set up in 2.26, they also expose the impetus that underlies Israel’s crime. As in the discourse of 2.4-13 (cf. vv. 5b, 8b, 11, 13), the absurd exchange of life-giver YHWH for lifeless objects points to a deep-rooted failure to know and honour YHWH as their true father. Building on the verbalized demonstration of the quotations, the allegation in 2.27aβ manifests this exact failure as the reason (כִּי) for the nonsensical transfer. The people of Israel direct their shameful and absurd appellation to tree and stone because they have turned their faces—and thus their words—as far away from YHWH as possible (פָּנוּ אֵלֵי עֵרְףִי וְלֹא פָנִים).<sup>23</sup>

The third inset of 2.27 further develops this line of thought and adds an

---

23. Cf. Holladay: “180-degree turn away from Yahweh”; p. 104. In 18.17, this allegation is turned against YHWH’s people (עֵרְףִי וְלֹא-פָנִים אֶרְאֶם בְּיוֹם אִידִם). In Crenshaw’s view, the insets in 2.27 depict “Satisfaction with Traditional Religion” (cf. *Conflict*, p. 26). Yet, this deliberate turn to alternatives indicates the exact opposite. It is moreover unclear how this quotation relates to the other examples that Crenshaw cites in this category.

important nuance with regard to Israel's shame. As noted by Wolff and Overholt, the final inset of the verse (קוֹמָה יְהוָה וְהוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ) closely resembles calls for help in the Psalms and other parts of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>24</sup> Read in light of these passages,<sup>25</sup> the double-imperative in 2.27b should be understood as an expectant and earnest cry to YHWH to deliver the speaker from looming defeat (cf. וּבִצְעַת רַעְתָּם). Resembling the two insets in 2.27a, the final member of the triplet of quotations likewise attributes words to Israel which are appropriate when spoken to YHWH. In fact, in 31.7, YHWH himself instructs his people to call on him in these terms (וְאָמְרוּ הוֹשֶׁעַ יְהוָה אֶת-עַמּוֹ). As previously, however, these words are transformed in the service of the frame, in particular in relation to the charge in 2.27aβ.

While this allegation of the people's turning (פָּנוּ) was primarily related to their turning *away* from YHWH, 2.27b depicts them as turning *back* to him for help.<sup>26</sup> Israel's legitimate words in 2.27a were transformed by the references to tree and stone; in 2.27b, this framing interference is performed by means of the people's own words: Israel has only praise for the idols, but the plea for help goes to YHWH; Israel speaks in emotional and familial terms to tree and stone,

---

24. Overholt, "Problem": "This is clearly stereotypical language, employing terms that are frequently used liturgically"; p. 271. Wolff notes that קוֹמָה normally stands with יהוה (except for Ps 44.27) and that the Hi. imptv. of ישע does normally not appear with a 1cp-suffix (except for Ps 106.47). In view of these derivations, Wolff judges the inset in Jer 2.27b to be inauthentic ("wir müssen die vorliegende Gestalt dem Propheten zuschreiben"); cf. "Zitat," pp. 31-32.

25. The Qal imptv. קוֹמָה appears only fifteen times. With three exceptions (Jdg 18.9; 1 Sam 9.26; Jer 46.16), it is always direct to YHWH—or Elohim (Ps 74.22; 82.8)—as a plea for the defeat of enemies (cf. אִיב, Num 10.35; Ps 3.8; צָרָה, Ps 7.6; רָשָׁע, Ps 17.13; נָבֵל, Ps 74.22) and to bring deliverance (cf. יִשְׁע, Ps 3.8; פָּדָה, Ps 44.27). For a substantial overview, see Willis, "QŪMĀH YHWH," *JNSL* 16 (1990): 207-221. Since a few occurrences of קוֹמָה are linked to the ark and YHWH's resting place (Num 10.35; Ps 132.8; 2 Chr 6.41), some exegetes have seen a theophanic and cultic background to this particular call; so, e.g., Frank Schnutenhaus, "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 76 (1964): 6-8. The Hi. imptv. of ישע occurs thirty-one times, of which only six stand outside the Psalter. While there are again exceptions (Jos 10.6; 2 Sam 14.4; 2 Kgs 6.26; 16.7), this plea likewise aims at divine deliverance (see, e.g., 17.14). The closest parallel of the combination in 2.27b occurs in Ps 3.8 (קוֹמָה יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ).

26. Cf. Herrmann: "Wer spricht zu wem? . . . Faktisch müßten das die gleichen sein, die in V. 27a zum Holz und Stein sprachen"; p. 148. Note in this regard the consistency of the referential verbs (הִבִּישׁוּ/הִקְמָה/פָּנוּ/יִאֲמְרוּ).

but for YHWH there are only demands; the idols are approached in intimate, individualistic ways, but YHWH is confronted by the indiscriminate, generic mass (“save *us!*”); Israel ascribes YHWH’s titles and power to the idols, but once in danger, he alone is approached as saviour. As previously with Jerusalem’s contradictory words in 2.23-25, the collision of the three insets in 2.27 supports the framing assertion that is placed between them. More than mere confirmation, however, this constructed clash of quotations shows that Israel’s turning is at work on more than one level: the people turn away from YHWH and turn to idols, then they turn back to YHWH, and as they do this, they overturn their own words.

### **2.3. Conclusion and Transition to Judah (2.28)**

Ultimately, it is these dynamics of the triplet that unpacks and affirms the fronted assertion that Israel’s shame is like the shame of a caught thief. While the devotion to lifeless idols is in itself a shameful act, the return to YHWH exposes the impotence of these idols and, in its wake, displays the absurdity of those who have turned to them. As tree and stone quickly prove to be incapable saviours, the people’s enthusiasm turns into embarrassment, their hopes into humiliation. Israel’s plea to YHWH, addressing him unabashedly as if nothing had happened, adds further disgrace. Finally, the people are shamed not only by their useless idols and their pretense before YHWH, but also by the self-contradiction that is created by the words attributed to them.<sup>27</sup> The three brief

---

27. Cf. Holladay: “Their shame derives not only from their pagan worship but from being caught in inconsistency”; p. 103. Manahan, for whom this quotation expresses defection, remarks that “Israel’s own words turn back on them as *evidence* of rebellion”; “Survey,” p. 173 (emphasis original). In Trapp’s survey, 2.27 is listed under “Laments and Confessions of Sin” (cf. “Other Sides,” p. 231). However, as demonstrated in our analysis, neither the insets in 2.27a nor the call for help in 2.27b fit this category. Trapp’s taxonomy becomes even less convincing when 2.27 is compared with the insets and frames of the other passages in this category (i.e., 8.19-20; 5.19; 45.3) and when it is recognized that 2.27 also appears under “Trust in self” alongside the

insets appear in this verse as having been uttered in the same breath so that the frame-inset dynamics in 2.27 expose the people's short-lived commitment and the impulsive character of their devotion. Due to the failure to know and venerate YHWH as the only rightful recipient of their familial appellations, Israel descends along a quick-paced downward spiral: once they have turned away from him, every next turn, be that to idols or back to him, only increases their disgrace and guilt. Likewise, as the theft of YHWH's deserved veneration results in taking his protection without adequate compensation, one act of stealing quickly leads to another. Exposed by the framing of their speech, Israel is caught and shamed in the act and YHWH's characterization of his people as incapable and guilty criminals is confirmed.

We end our discussion by relating these observations to 2.28. It is not until this verse that the addressee of YHWH's third-person account in 2.26-27 is identified (הָיָו אֱלֹהֵיךָ יְהוָה, v. 28b). The result of these communication dynamics is that Israel's crime, shame, and speech must be understood as an object lesson that YHWH has rehearsed before his addressee Judah. This sudden and confrontational switch to direct address is accompanied by a resumptive waw and a provocative question (וְאֵיזָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ) which brings to bear the full weight of YHWH's expositions in 2.26-27 onto Judah.<sup>28</sup> At the root of this application via analogy lies the assertion that the Judahites venerate self-made deities (אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ לָךְ) and are thus exactly on the same absurd track as Israel was with its idols of wood and stone. As a sarcastic challenge, or possibly as an implicit threat, YHWH directs Judah to these gods if help is needed (יָקוּמוּ אֱמִיּוֹשִׁיעֶיךָ בָּעֵת)

---

insets of 2.20-25.

28. Some interpreters recall here the question of the *irrealis* insets in 2.6 and 2.8 (אֵיזָה יְהוָה; e.g., Fischer, p. 171; Overholt, "Problem," p. 269). In 2.28, however, the question is uttered *by* YHWH and fulfills a provocative and polemical function similar to the Rabshakeh's taunt in 2 Kgs 18.34 (אֵיזָה אֱלֹהֵי חֲמַת וְאַרְפָּד; cf. Carroll, p. 135) and YHWH's exaltation in Deut 32.37-38 (אֵיזָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ; cf. Lundbom, p. 287). Burnett hence is correct to regard it as an "ironic echo"; "Changing," p. 295.

רָעָתָךְ). Linked by this charge,<sup>29</sup> Judah's current behaviour is connected directly with the quotation in 2.27b: if Judah, like Israel in the past, decides to make their own gods, they ought not to repeat the shameful recourse to YHWH when these turn out to be powerless. While 2.28a establishes this fateful connection between what Israel *did* and what Judah *is doing*, 2.28b reveals the rationale which informs all of YHWH's applied object lessons:

כִּי מְסֻפָּר עָרֶיךָ    Surely, as numerous as your cities,  
הֵיוּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְהוּדָה    so are your gods, O Judah.

Indicated by the asseverative כִּי and the direct, vocative appeal at the finale of the unit, YHWH's account of Israel's shameful conduct is urgently needed because the situation has become critical: the turning away from YHWH is already rampant across the Judahite territory. In view of their host of gods, the negative portrayal of Israel as a shamed and caught criminal in 2.26-27 is meant to shake up the people of Judah to their scandalous and absurd way of life. The confrontation of Judah initiated here via the switch from referential account to direct address, the challenging question, and the explicit, literary analogy to Israel's negative example, is further developed in 2.29-32.<sup>30</sup>

---

29. Lundbom (cf. pp. 286-287) detects a chiasmic structure behind this parallel and delimitates therefore 2.25b-27aβ and 2.27b-28 as separate units. This arrangement, however, necessitates to split both 2.27 and 2.28 in half and to regard 2.28b as a supplement, possibly taken from 11.13a. Yet, the relationship between 2.28 and 11.13 is far from self-evident. Whereas 2.28 parallels in Jer-MT only 11.13a, Jer-LXX adds to this καὶ κατ' ἀριθμὸν διόδων τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔθουσιν τῇ Βαβυλῶνι which is, however, only part of 11.13b; cf. Herrmann, p. 149. Moreover, the dependence of 2.28 on 11.13 itself is uncertain and some exegetes even reverse the direction of influence; see, e.g., Cornill (p. 27), Janzen (*Studies*, p. 121) and Parke-Taylor (*Doublets*, p. 186).

30. Cf. Schmidt: "V. 28 zieht die Folgerung und bereitet mit der Wendung an die Hörer V. 29 vor"; p. 94.



### 3. Frame and Inset in 2.29-32

Compared to 2.26-28, the speech quotation in our next unit is presented in an entirely different garb: instead of multiple insets that form parallel and contradictory structures, 2.29-32 contains only one quoted utterance which is much more complex than the abrupt, two-word phrases in 2.27:

רָדְנוּ “We have gone our own way,  
לֹא-נָבוֹא עוֹד אֵלֶיךָ we will not come to you again.”

In light of this dissimilar constellation, we can surmise that the quoted announcement in 2.31 presupposes a different incentive on the part of its speakers than the rapid outcries before the idols and YHWH. At the same time, however, the quotation is attributed to Israel (לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, v. 31a) and is part of YHWH's object lesson before the Judahites (cf. 2mp-address across vv. 29-31a). While we will consider this communication structure in our analysis, a full discussion of its shape and the quotations' role within it is reserved for the integrated reading of 2.26-32 which follows below. We begin our discussion as in the previous unit with the perspective and issues that are established in the frame prior to the quotation in 2.31.

#### 3.1. Accusation and Discipline (2.29-30)

YHWH's speech to the people of Judah, addressed as in 2.4-9 by 2mp-verbs (תְּרִיבוּ/פָּשַׁעְתֶּם), continues in the same confrontational manner that has closed 2.26-28. The first verse of 2.29-32 does not portray YHWH in dispute with the people but their contention against him (לָמָּה תְּרִיבוּ אֵלַי, v. 29a) which is a noteworthy inversion of the parallel אָרִיב אֶתְכֶם statement in 2.9. The main point of this startling reversal, however, is that any attack of this kind is entirely unfounded; all of the fault lies with Judah, and not only with the shepherds

(בִּי, v. 8) but with everyone (בְּכֻלָּם פִּשְׁעֵתֶם בִּי, v. 29b).<sup>31</sup> As the counterpart to this comprehensive accusation (cf. v. 26b), we notice a heightened focus on YHWH. In contrast to 2.26-28—there was only one reference to YHWH and this was negative (בִּי־פָנּוּ אֵלַי עָרִי, v. 27aβ)—the discourse of 2.29-32 extensively draws attention to his character and actions and this new emphasis is introduced in 2.29 (אֵלַי/בִּי).<sup>32</sup> The personalization of YHWH's address is attended by an increase of challenging questions which continue the confrontation that 2.28 had initiated (וְאֵיךְ).<sup>33</sup> Similar to the opening of 2.5 (מִה־מִּצָּאוֹ), the frame of 2.29-31 thus begins by depicting YHWH as confounded by Judah's accusations. The complete corruption of Judah's society that is castigated in 2.29 renders any contention against his indisputable character as utterly ludicrous.

In view of this sharp and sweeping opening, we might expect a justification to follow, either in form of a catalogue of transgressions (cf. vv. 7-8) or through a depiction of the people's outrageous, religious activities (cf. vv. 10-13). Yet, what is formulated in 2.30 is instead a record of YHWH's corrective efforts. What the complementary pair of disciplinary deeds (the attack against Judah's sons) and words (the sending of prophets) demonstrates is that any such efforts have been without success. Corresponding to the fronted לְשֵׁן ("in vain"),<sup>34</sup> the frustration of YHWH's correction is highlighted especially by the

---

31. Instead of תְּרִיבוּ, Jer-LXX reads λαλεῖτε and emphasizes the people's guilt (ἡσέβησατε καὶ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἡνομήσατε εἰς ἐμέ). This reading could be understood as a reflection of how absurd and unexpected Judah's accusation against YHWH is. Perhaps for the same reason, Targum (לְמָא אַתּוֹן מְדַמֵּן לְמַדָּן לְקַבִּיל פְּתוּגָמִי) and Vulgate (quid vultis mecum iudicio contendere) soften the tone of 2.29.

32. Cf. הִכִּיתִי (v. 30a); הִיִּיתִי (v. 31a); עָמִי (vv. 31b, 32b); שְׂכַחוּנִי (v. 32b). The self-referential style of YHWH's address constitutes yet another parallel to 2.4-13, especially with regard to its opening phrase (בִּי/מִעָלַי, v. 5. See further vv. 7, 9, 13).

33. Cf. לָמָּה (v. 29); הִמְדַּבֵּר/מְדוּעַ/אֵם (v. 31); הִתְשַׁבַּח (v. 32). On the dominance of questions in 2.29-32, see Böhler, "Geschlechterdifferenz," p. 98.

34. As noted by Fischer (p. 172) and Holladay (p. 107), using the pessimistic expression

formulation מוסר + לקח which occurs here and throughout Jeremiah only ever in negation (cf. 5.3; 7.28; 17.23; 32.33; 35.13).<sup>35</sup>

The reference to Judah's sons (אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם) in 2.30a has often troubled interpreters: if YHWH addresses the current people of Judah, how can his discipline apply to a future generation? Although none of the suggested solutions can be ruled out conclusively,<sup>36</sup> the extensive parallels between 2.4-13 and 2.26-32 suggest that 2.30a presents the outworking of YHWH's announcement to strive with Judah's progeny (וְאֶת־בְּנֵי בְנֵיכֶם אֶרִיב, v. 9b). If his assault against the rising generation had been successful, maybe Judah's collapse would have come to a halt. As it stands, however, 2.30a gives substance to the preceding assertion that everyone has transgressed (כֻּלְכֶם פָּשְׁעֹתֶם), including the obstinate offspring.<sup>37</sup> Since the younger generation follows the bad example of their parents, there is little to no hope that Judah's posture towards YHWH will change in the foreseeable future.

The slaying of YHWH's prophets which is denounced in 2.30b confirms this diagnosis and takes it a step further.<sup>38</sup> As in the first part of this verse, this

---

לְשׁוֹא in a fronted position is an idiosyncratic feature of Jeremiah (4.30; 6.29; 18.15; 46.11). All other occurrences of לְשׁוֹא are in medial or final positions; cf. Exod 20.7; Deut 5.11; Ps 24.4; 139.20.

35. Besides one other negative use of מוסר + לקח in Zeph 3.2, this phrase occurs only twice more, yet both times in a positive light (cf. Prov 1.3; 24.32).

36. Rudolph (p. 16; cf. *BHS*) changes the text to אֶבְרִיתֶם; others propose אֶבְרִיתֶם (cf. Giesebrecht, p. 12) or אֶת בְּנֵי (cf. Hoffmann, "Jeremiah 2.30," p. 419). Loewenclau's בְּנֵי־אִיִּם ("durch Propheten"; cf. Hos 6.5) takes the verse into an entirely different direction; "Jeremia ii 30," pp. 120-121. Still others argue that בְּנֵיכֶם must be understood as a reference to the people in general; see, e.g., A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah: Vol. I Jeremiah I-XXIV* (CB; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), pp. 98-99; Duhm: "Inbegriff des Volkes"; p. 30; Craigie, p. 40.

37. As previously in the trans-generational dynamics in 2.4-9, the rhetoric of 2.30a thus likewise manifests the "indivisibility of Israel's apostasy" (McKane, p. 50).

38. Several suggestions have been made for the historical background of this allegation; for an overview, see, e.g., Lundbom, pp. 289-290. Given the general tone of 2.30b, however, most interpreters conclude that a specific situation is not in view; cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Der historische Rekurs bleibt auch hier ganz allgemein, nur ein 'daß' interessiert, nicht seine näheren Umstände"; p. 178; so also Herrmann, p. 154; Carroll, p. 137; Fretheim, p. 71; Wanke, p. 44.

account has generated several proposals for emendation, especially with respect to the two 2mp-suffixes of the phrase **אָכְלָה חֲרֹבָתְכֶם נְבִיאֵיכֶם**. Some exegetes have adopted the referentially unspecific rendition of Jer-LXX (μάχαίρα) or have emended **נְבִיאֵיכֶם**,<sup>39</sup> but such changes remain arbitrary and, what is worse, they undercut the force of the argumentation. The people of Judah have been killing YHWH's messengers who are, in the full sense of the word, *their* prophets; they are members of their community and sent for their benefit. The parallelism of **בְּנֵיכֶם** and **נְבִיאֵיכֶם** thus articulates the full extent of the hopelessness of Judah's reformation: the sons are struck, but do not change; the prophets are sent for change, but are struck dead. Determined to withstand YHWH, the people of Judah do not even stop from killing their own peers and pursue this silencing of the divine voice with the vehemence of a destroying lion (**כְּאַרְיֵה מְשַׁחִית**).<sup>40</sup>

### 3.2. The Inset in 2.31

In a quick succession of accusations, 2.29-30 fronts the unit with a characterization of Judah as a comprehensively guilty people who will not be receptive to any of YHWH's strategies for rectification. The corrective

---

39. According to Duhm (p. 30), reading **חֲרָב** with Jer-LXX makes it clear that "your prophets" are Judah's own, viz. the "false" prophets. If these were YHWH's prophets, so Duhm, the verse would have to say "my prophets" which is, in fact, precisely the correction offered by Volz (p. 27). Holladay opts for "a sword ate of you"; p. 107. Hoffmann reads "my sword"; "Jeremiah 2:30," p. 421. Ivo Meyer translates "Es fraß das [...] Schwert eure Propheten" and mounts the intricate hypothesis of an original rendering in line with Jer-LXX which was changed in a later period in order to hold Judah accountable for the prophetic martyrs: "Das strafende Schwert (Jahwes) wurde nun zum mordenden Schwert jenes Israel, das seine Propheten verfolgt"; *Jeremia und die Falschen Propheten* (OBO 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 77-80. In the end, however, there is simply no good reason to deny that **נְבִיאֵיכֶם** refers to YHWH's prophets, "d.h., die zu euch gesandten Jahwepropheten"; Rudolph, p. 16. So also McKane (p. 51) and Fischer (p. 172). Adherence to Jer-MT stands also at the end of Bourguet's detailed discussion; cf. *Métaphores*, pp. 204-207.

40. The lion simile is used in 12.8 to express Judah's resistance to YHWH. It appears with YHWH as referent also in Hos 13.8 (**כְּלִבְיָא**). For a detailed discussion of the leonine imagery in 2.30, see Bourguet, *Métaphores*, pp. 208-212. Strawn draws attention to swords in the ANE that have a lion head as the hilt; cf. *Lion*, p. 65.

punishment is fruitless, the word of warning receives no hearing. On the contrary, his attempts to speak through his prophets have led only to bloodshed and thus to an increase of Judah's record of transgressions. YHWH is rightly astonished that the people would mount allegation against him (לְמַהּ, v. 29). It is this frame of divine accusations, efforts, and frustration, and the people's hopeless and inexplicable behaviour that is set before the quoted inset in 2.31. To fully capture the integration and contribution of the quotation, we will examine the initial, direct appeal, the switch to the referential discourse about Israel (לְיִשְׂרָאֵל), the מדוע + אם + ה- construction in which the *verbum dicendi* occurs (מַדּוּעַ אִם הָאֵל), the phrasing of the inset, and lastly, the relation of the quotation to the closing question in 2.32.

An appropriate sequel to the account of YHWH's frustrated discipline, the first three words of 2.31 are a vocative (הַדּוֹר), a direct address (אַתָּה), and an imperative (רֵא).<sup>41</sup> This urgent call to "consider the word of YHWH" is certainly meant to grab the attention of the defiant Judahites,<sup>42</sup> yet it also functions as a formal introduction to the interrogative structure and the referential account that occupies the rest of the unit. As in 2.10-13 and in 2.23-25, this pause and transition indicates a shift in YHWH's communicative strategy. If Judah approaches YHWH only with inexplicable allegations (v. 29) and refuses to heed his discipline (v. 30), perhaps the object lesson about Israel (לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) will provide a more compelling means of communication and conviction. Mirroring 2.26-28, YHWH situates Judah's apostasy in relation to the history of Israel *en large* and again uses a combination of quotation and question towards this end.

---

41. Given the context of 2.29-30, this accumulation is entirely feasible and must not be dismissed in favour of hypothetical reconstructions (so, e.g., also Weiser, p. 28; for the proposals by van der Wal and Holladay, see the translation in chapter three above). Duhm's unfounded claim (p. 31) that this entire phrase is an addition by a later reader has been followed, e.g., by Rudolph, p. 18 (cf. *BHS*); Nicholson, p. 38; Craigie, p. 40.

42. Cf. Fischer: "Angezielt ist intensive Wahrnehmung"; p. 173.

Several of the previous quotations were linked to questions (cf. vv. 5-6, 27-28),<sup>43</sup> yet the bond of insertion and interrogation that we encounter in 2.31 is of a special kind. Israel's quoted words form here an integral part of the tripartite  $\text{מְדוּעַ} + \text{אִם} + \text{ה-}$  construction (cf. v. 14, likewise with referent  $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ ) which in this exact formulation is unique to Jeremiah:<sup>44</sup>

$\text{הַמִּדְבָּר הָיִיתִי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$	Have I been a wilderness to Israel,
$\text{אִם אֶרֶץ מְאֵפֶלִיָּה}$	or a land of darkness?
$\text{מְדוּעַ אָמְרוּ עַמִּי}$	Why have my people said:
$\text{רָדְנוּ}$	"We have gone our own way,
$\text{לֹא-נָבוֹא עוֹד אֵלֶיךָ}$	we will not come to you again."

According to the common understanding of this structure, the first two parts ( $\text{הַמִּדְבָּר/אִם}$ ) do not formulate questions posed to obtain information but function instead as a rhetorical foil that mounts a proposition which cannot be countered. The  $\text{מְדוּעַ}$ -component "describes an action the reasonableness of which is questioned or even protested."<sup>45</sup> In the case of 2.31, presumably everyone would deny the startling suggestion that YHWH was a desert or

---

43. Overholt asserts that all the quotations in Jer 2—except for 2.35—are related to rhetorical questions. As we have seen, however, this is not the case for the insets in 2.8, 20, 25; cf. "Problem," p. 267.

44. Cf. 2.14, 31; 8.4-5, 19, 22; 14.19; 22.28; 49.1 ( $\text{מְדוּעַ}$  occurs sixteen times in Jeremiah and only four times in the other prophetic books; cf. Isa 5.4; 50.2; 63.2; Mal 2.10). The closest parallels to this tripartite construction are found in Jdg 11.25-26 and Job 21.4. Passages like 2 Sam 11.20, Job 7.12, Mal 2.10, and Isa 50.2 represent some components of this structure, yet none of them fully replicates the  $\text{מְדוּעַ} + \text{אִם} + \text{ה-}$  pattern. For examples and discussion, see Moshe Held, "Rhetorical Questions in Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *ErIsr* 9 (1969): 71-79 (for 2.31, see p. 76); Brueggemann, "Questions," pp. 358-374 (for 2.31, see pp. 360, 369-71); Watson, *Poetry*, pp. 338-342. For the variation  $\text{כִּי} + \text{אִם} + \text{ה-}$ , see David A. Diewert, "Job 7.12: Yam, Tannin and the Surveillance of Job," *JBL* 106 (1987): 211-215. Tripartite rhetorical questions have been explored also in Hebrew narratives; cf. Adina Moshavi, "Two Types of Argumentation Involving Rhetorical Questions in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue," *Bib* 90 (2009): 32-46.

45. Diewert, "Surveillance," p. 212. In Brueggemann's terms, the first two parts "assert a common ground of opinion held by both parties" and the third element presents "the advance of the argument beyond the consensus"; "Questions," pp. 370-371.

darkness; consequently, if he has *not* been either of these life-defying forces, it would be absolutely unjustified, indeed absurd, for his people to abandon him. Hence, the threefold structure and its concluding quotation would function primarily to expose and condemn Israel's unreasonable behaviour.

While this interpretation coheres with the dynamics of the  $\text{ה} + \text{אם} + \text{מדוע}$ -structure elsewhere in Jeremiah, the present passage suggests a slightly nuanced reading. As Fretheim has pointed out, there are good reasons to regard 2.29-32 as a divine lament. The increased self-focus of YHWH's address, his shock at Judah's inexplicable contention, and the frustration of his corrective efforts certainly fits this description. The three interrogative elements in 2.31 emerge then as "neither rhetorical nor informational [but] existential."<sup>46</sup>

From this angle, the  $\text{ה} + \text{אם} + \text{מדוע}$ -frame of the speech quotation is not merely a rhetorical trap, but an honest expression of YHWH's dismay and disappointment: is *this* how Israel thinks of him, the fountain of living waters (v. 13), who protected them in the desert (vv. 6-7)? Bearing in mind his repeated efforts to open their eyes to his care and their dangers (cf. vv. 5, 8, 13, 26-27), a *Gottesbild* of this kind points once more to Israel's deep-rooted failure to know YHWH as their redeemer.<sup>47</sup> The interrogative frame of the quotation exposes Israel's conduct as unfounded, but it also serves to manifest the root problem that underlies this behaviour. The drastic and inexplicable misconceptions of his good intentions leaves YHWH deeply dismayed.<sup>48</sup>

Manifesting its contextually conditioned nature, this double-sided

---

46. Fretheim, p. 71.

47. In Weiser's view, Israel has distorted the history with YHWH to a "negativen, der chaotischen Wüstenlandschaft vergleichbaren Geschichtsbild"; p. 28.

48. Cf. Volz: "In zwei schmerzlichen Fragen bringt Jeremia die Klage Jahwes zum Ausdruck. . . . Der große helfende Gott wird von seinem Volk gemieden, wie man die gefährvolle, unfruchtbare Wüste meidet"; p. 30. So also Wanke: "Anklagend, ja klagend"; p. 44. Brueggemann thinks that the estrangement between YHWH and people stems not from their twisted views but from their forgetfulness (cf. "Questions," p. 360). Yet, as he himself notes (p. 369), the  $\text{שכח}$ -charge in 2.32 is technically not part of the structure of 2.31.

perspective of exposure and divine lament is also reflected in the phrasing of the inset. The syntactical imbalance between a short, fronted assertion (רָדְנוּ) and a longer, more developed construction recalls Jerusalem's explosive declaration in 2.25b. In striking contrast, however, the inset in 2.31 is presented as speech to YHWH (אֱלֹהִי). Rather than speaking past their God in an aloof and ignorant manner, Israel confronts him directly, intensifying the initial declaration of independence with a harsh refusal to ever again come back to him (לֹא-נָבוֹא).<sup>49</sup>

This rigid determination runs counter to Israel's experience of YHWH's leadership (cf. הִמּוֹלִיד, v. 6; וְאַבִּיא, v. 7), moreover the self-asserting resolve of the people to go their own way (רָדְנוּ/נָבוֹא) clashes with YHWH's self-references in 2.29-32. The more the divine character is brought to the forefront, the stronger Israel's resolution to withdraw from YHWH becomes. This framed juxtaposition between the YHWH-centred discourse and the people's self-centred rejection manifests their distorted view of his character. He is the very opposite of desert and darkness, yet his own people speak to him only in negation and rejection, walk away from him, and are determined never to come back.

### 3.3. Conclusion: YHWH's Lament (2.32)

That the quotation is framed as an exposition of Israel's absurdity and as a rationale for YHWH's laments is also reflected in the final verse of the unit. As with the sexual and relational language in 2.20-25, the bridal imagery in 2.32 has likewise been regarded by several exegetes as an alleged marriage metaphor. But as Moughtin-Mumby has astutely pointed out, the relationship

---

49. On the basis of "going to YHWH"-parallels in the Psalms, Overholt has suggested that the inset reflects stereotypical language related to temple worship; cf. "Problem," p. 272. Although the charge of idol-veneration lies close at hand (cf. vv. 27-28), the combination of + בּוֹא אֵל is used in such a wide variety of contexts (cf. *DCH* 2:112-13) that it is difficult to determine the exact nuance in this text; cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Vage Formulierung"; p. 179.



that is described is not between a bride and YHWH, but between a bride and her attire.<sup>50</sup> Consequently, the image does not criticize marital conduct, which would certainly be out of place in 2.26-32, but highlight the foolish and even bizarre nature of Israel's departure from YHWH. No bride would ever be careless with her precious apparel (הַתְּשֻׁכָּח), yet the people have neglected their own God (שִׁכְחוּ־נִי).<sup>51</sup>

Confirming what was articulated in the speech quotation, this closing image highlights just how unnatural Israel's conduct towards YHWH has become. Although he is elevated by the implicit association with precious objects, the people appear to be suffering from a serious failure to perceive whom they have rejected. That this deplorable situation has been going on for a long time (יָמִים אֲזַן מְסֻפָּר, v. 32b) further intensifies the depth of their corruption and adds greater substance to YHWH's lament.<sup>52</sup>

After Judah's unfounded allegations and the frustration of YHWH's corrective measures in 2.29-30, the switch to his referential account about Israel has initiated the same comparative mode of argumentation that we have already seen in 2.26-28. Subsumed under the rhetorical dynamics of the sophisticated ה

---

50. Cf. Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*: "Jeremiah 2.32 simply cannot be characterized as an instance of 'the marriage metaphor,' but is rather more idiosyncratic, reflecting the distinctive style and themes of the prophetic poetry in which it is set"; p. 91. Comments about the supposed marriage metaphor in 2.32 appear often with reference to 2.2; see, e.g., Stulman ("Israel scandalously rejects her bridegroom"; p. 52); Brueggemann, p. 37; Sohn, *Husband*, pp. 85-86; Weiser, p. 28; Overholt, "Problem," p. 270.

51. As Fischer notes (p. 173), the disparity between material objects and YHWH heightens the inexplicable nature of Israel's conduct. In view of the severity and resolution voiced in the inset, it is hardly appropriate to say that Israel "has forgotten" YHWH. The verb שכח occurs thirteen times in Jeremiah and "to forget" fits well in several passages (20.11, 23.40, 50.5, all of which are negated; see further 44.9). Elsewhere, however, שכח relates to the people's waywardness (3.21), trust in lies (13.25) or devotion to other gods (18.15; 23.37); see further 30.14; 50.6. Evidently, the critique in these passage is not directed against a lack of recollection but against a neglect in favour of alternatives. For this nuance of שכח elsewhere in the HB, see DCH 8:350.

52. Cf. Volz: "Daß die Braut ihren Schmuck vergäße, ist nicht auszudenken; Israel aber hat seinen Schmuck und eigensten Besitz vergessen. Der Vers berührt sich in Stimmung und Inhalt mit 10f., dort und hier das wehmütige עָמִי; hier wie dort keine Anrede, sondern der verhaltene, tiefbetrübte Ton des in sich zurückgezogenen Schmerzes"; p. 30.

אם + מדוע + structure, the inset in 2.31 articulates Israel's absurd attitude towards YHWH in the hearing of his addressee Judah. For no apparent reason and against the testimony of his guidance, provision, and protection, the people have cultivated a deeply distorted and antagonistic view of their God. The inset's phrasing and framing shows that Israel did indeed avoid YHWH as one would avoid the life-threatening desert and, in combination with the unnaturally negligent bride in 2.32, demonstrates the hopelessness of Israel's stance. Running from YHWH and showing less regard for him than a maiden for mere materials, Israel's God is left to grieve the plight of his people who walk away without even looking back.

#### **4. Quotation and Communication: An Integrated Reading of 2.26-32**

Having now completed our analysis of the frame-inset relations in 2.26-28 and 2.29-32, we will briefly discuss the contribution of the quotations within the unit as a whole. This integrated reading aims primarily to provide an outline of the communication structures of 2.26-32 and to determine the role of the four quoted insets within them. As argued in our text analysis in chapter three and more substantially in our discussion of 2.28, the entire unit must be understood as an address to the people of Judah (cf. the vocative יהודה in v. 28b and the 2mp-verbs in vv. 29-31b). The fronted, referential account about Israel's shame and speech, the delayed identification of YHWH's addressee, and the explicit, literary analogies across 2.27-28 indicate the same comparative mode that we saw at work in 2.4-9 and 2.14-19. As in these two sections, YHWH's address in 2.26-28 employs a negative object lesson of Israel's past behaviour in order to prevent his listeners from committing the same fateful mistakes.

These dynamics continue seamlessly in 2.29-32. Departing from the

direct address in 2.28, the first verse directs the Judahites to YHWH's unassailable character and declares all of them guilty. Since they continue Israel's crimes (cf. vv. 26b, 28), they have absolutely no right to confront YHWH. The depiction of resistant sons and slain prophets in 2.30 further consolidates this assertion and highlights the hopelessness of YHWH's reformatory efforts. In the final attempt to open Judah's eyes to the dire reality of their situation, YHWH's communicative strategy changes in 2.31-32 from direct accusations to a referential object lesson of absurd speech and inexplicable withdrawal. Paralleling the dynamics between Israel and Jerusalem in 2.14-19, this lesson likewise opens with an irrefutable  $\text{אם} + \text{מדוע}$ -question with Israel as the subject. The background to this construction is provided in the material of 2.4-13: YHWH is not a wilderness, rather, he delivers from the wilderness (cf. v. 6). Fronted by an emphatic address (v. 31a), the accumulation of probing questions, the quoted demonstration of Israel's harsh words, and the confirmation of their unnatural behaviour via the image of the bride ultimately serves as a striking confrontation against Judah. By observing the unreasonable conduct of their own people and by overhearing YHWH's lamentations, they are prompted not to repeat the same mistake.

This rhetorical manoeuvre comes into focus more explicitly when the parallel endings of 2.28 ( $\text{בִּי מִסְפֵּר עָרֶיךָ הֵיוּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְהוּדָה}$ ) and 2.32 ( $\text{וְעַמִּי שְׂבָחוּנִי יָמִים אֵין}$ ) are taken into account. Having as many gods as cities, Judah is not far from Israel's negative example of abandoning YHWH for days without number. In fact, since Judah shows no response to his discipline and even dares to confront YHWH (v. 29), it seems that this development is already underway. After all, Judah, like Israel, venerates self-made idols (vv. 27-28) and is guilty across its entire community (vv. 26b, 29b). The parallel, numerical rhetoric that closes the two units (cf.  $\text{מִסְפֵּר}$ , vv. 28b, 32b) confirms the dire assertion that Judah is continuing Israel's abandonment of YHWH. All demonstrations of

shameful turning and absurd words have not sufficed. The Judahites are already swept up in the history of Israel's disregard and departure from their God.

If the results of our analytical endeavours are related to this outline of the unit's communication structure, we come to see that the four quoted insets fully participate in YHWH's rhetoric of comparison. As Israel's negative example is set before Judah, the juxtaposed quotations in 2.27 depict their speakers as irrational and self-contradictory and thereby confirm the fronted depiction of Israel. The triplet of framed words convicts Israel as thieves of YHWH's rightful titles and acclaim and shows their shameful disappointment in the idols and their shameless return to YHWH. When Judah witnesses these dynamics, the challenge naturally arises not to emulate this example of shame, guilt, and humiliation. The inset in 2.31 functions in the same way. Framed by the exposition of Judah's guilt and hopelessness in 2.29-30, the quotation demonstrates Israel's distorted ideas about YHWH so that Judah is charged not to act in these ways.

That this contribution of the quotations has not been recognized previously has at least two reasons: 1) the insets in 2.27 were analyzed in conjunction with those in 2.20-25, thus obfuscating the parallels between 2.26-28 and 2.29-32;<sup>53</sup> 2) the communication structures of the unit were not taken into account and the four referential quotations of Israel were ascribed to Judah, YHWH's addressee. Building on the arguments for the unity of 2.20-25 in our text analysis in chapter three, the discussion of Jerusalem's three quotes and the triplet of Israel's exclamations in 2.27 calls attention to the dissimilarity between these two sections. The identity of the quoted speaker has not been

---

53. Craigie (p. 36) and Schmidt ("gegliedert durch Zitate"; p. 85), in fact, adduce the sequence of the quotation in 2.20, 23, 25, 27 in support of the unity of 2.20-28.

discerned with sufficient care which has led to the confusion of address and reference. Confirming the positions advanced by Biddle and Hardmeier (see chapter two above, “Context and Communication”), our reading shows that failing to attend to the text’s communication structures inevitably distorts the analysis of frame and inset. Only if these dynamics are carefully discerned can the full contribution of the quotations come to light.

## 5. Conclusion

We have seen throughout our analysis afresh the inseparable bond between quotation and context. The first two insets in 2.26-28 are tied to the simile of thief and shame via the *verbum dicendi* אִמְרִים and are bound to tree and stone through their address format and complementary structure. The third inset is fused with its frame via the repetition of יֵשַׁע + קוֹם across 2.27b-28. In 2.29-32, the incorporation of the quotation within the אִם + מְדוּעַ + הֵ-structure and the referential phrasing of the *verbum dicendi* (אִמְרֵי) likewise anchors the quoted words within their context. As in the previous units of 2.1-3.5, these various means of integration indicate that removing these four insets for the sake of systematization would seriously deflect from the contribution that they are designed to make within their natural habitat.

Placed in sequence to the fronted, unspecific image of shame and crime, the triplet of quotations in 2.27 supplies the mechanics, details, and extent of Israel’s despicable behaviour. As in the case of Jerusalem’s lie in 2.23, Israel’s appropriate words have been transformed into self-condemning speech through the interference of the frame of tree and stone. The shameful inconsistency of the people’s devotion was played out by the quick, verbal shift from idols to YHWH which verifies and expands the frame’s central assertion of Israel’s turning disposition. In the instance of 2.31, the integration of Israel’s negative words within YHWH’s questions and lamentations has transformed the

quotation from a mere antithetical statement to a demonstration of Israel's distorted and deplorable view of their God. Whether as three staccato exclamations coloured by an *a priori* characterization or as one elaborate statement couched between appeals and lament, the quotations of Israel have been shaped throughout to support the communicative strategies of the unit.

Framed within their structural, literary, and rhetorical environment, all four quotations ultimately serve to paint a picture of Israel which demonstrates the veracity of YHWH's initial characterization (v. 26a) and closing assertion (v. 32b). As they give voice to the people's shameful and irrational devotion to lifeless object and the distorted *Gottesbild* which they have cultivated, the quotations expose Israel's deep-rooted failure to know YHWH as their father and redeemer. The absurdity of their verbal behaviour affirms YHWH's reports of their turning and their unnatural conduct. As in 2.4-9 and 2.20-25, Gerrig and Clark's "Demonstrative Theory" (cf. chapter two, section 4.3 above) has been shown to offer useful guidelines in the analysis of prophetic speech quotations. In 2.26-32, verbal demonstration and descriptive accounts are correlated to provide a full picture of Israel's culpability and the inexplicable character of their words and actions towards YHWH.

With this contribution to YHWH's address, the quotations of referent Israel play a vital role in creating the negative example set before Judah. The four insets provide the vivid and direct means to confront Judah with the verbal record of the foolish history of their own people. As with the quotations of Judah's ancestors in 2.5-6, the act of quoting a speaker who is related to YHWH's addressee is thus used to teach, expose, and reform; failed words spoken in the past are framed to bring about right responses in the present. Yet, given how closely Judah's behaviour is aligned with that of Israel, it will not be too long

before they also ascribe YHWH's parental titles to their dumb idols and declare their irrational independence from him. Inasmuch as these developments cause YHWH to shake his head in grief, his confrontation in 2.28 emphasizes that it will then be too late to return to him when a reliable saviour is needed.

The address to the people in 2.1-3.5 ends with this scene of Judah's foolishness and YHWH's sad resignation. In two parallel movements, Israel's God has confronted his audience with the failures and senseless behaviour of their ancestors in order to stop them from repeating the negative examples set before them. Both 2.4-13 and 2.26-32 expose the people's staggering misconceptions of YHWH's character and their inexplicable and irreversible commitment to destructive idols. In order to turn the people of Judah back to their God, more than images, comparisons, and quoted words will be needed. Although 2.14-25 shows that Jerusalem likewise rejects her liberator and fails to learn from the past, YHWH turns his attention in the remaining two units of 2.1-3.5 back to the city. Judah is beyond the point of no return; perhaps there is still hope for Jerusalem.

## Chapter Seven - The Speech Quotations in Jeremiah 2.33-37

2.33	מִה־תִּטְבִּי דֶרֶךְךָ לְבַקֵּשׁ אֲהָבָה לְכֵן גַּם אֶת־הָרָעוֹת לְמַדְתִּי אֶת־דֶּרֶכֶיךָ	How well you make your way to seek love! Because of this, even for evil deeds you have trained your ways.
2.34	גַּם בְּכַנְפֶּיךָ נִמְצָאוּ דָם נַפְשׁוֹת אֲבִיּוֹנִים נְקִיִּים לֹא־בַמְּחִתָּתָם מְצָאתִים כִּי עַל־כָּל־אֵלֶּה	Even on the hem of your garments one can find the blood of needy and innocent lives, although you have not found them breaking in. Yet, in spite of all of these things
2.35	וַתֹּאמְרִי כִי נְקִיתִי אֲדָ שָׁב אַפּוֹ מִמֶּנִּי הִנְנִי נִשְׁפָּט אוֹתְךָ עַל־אֲמַרְךָ לֹא חָטָאתִי	you said: "I am certainly innocent! Surely his anger has turned from me!" Behold, I am about to enter into judgment with you because you have said: "I have not sinned."
2.36	מִה־תִּזְלִי מֵאֵד לְשַׁנּוֹת אֶת־דֶּרֶכְךָ גַּם מִמִּצְרַיִם תִּבּוֹשִׁי כַּאֲשֶׁר־בָּשַׁתָּ מֵאַשּׁוּר	How much you go about to change your way! Even by Egypt you will be shamed, just as you were shamed by Assyria.
2.37	גַּם מֵאֵת זֶה תֵּצֵא וַיָּדִיךְ עַל־רֹאשְׁךָ כִּי־מָאֵס יְהוָה בְּמִבְטְחֶיךָ וְלֹא תִצְלִיחַ לָהֶם	Yes, from here you will go out with your hands on your head. For YHWH has rejected those in whom you trust and you will not succeed by their help.

### 1. Introduction

After YHWH's address to Judah comes to a desolate end with the lamentations of 2.31-32, the focus of the discourse turns back to Jerusalem. Besides the notable shift back to the 2fs-address of 2.2-3 and 2.16-25, the unit of 2.33-37 also shares many lexical, thematic, and rhetorical aspects with the previous city-sections.<sup>1</sup>

1. Cf. דרך (vv. 17, 18, 23, 33, 36); בקש (vv. 24, 33; cf. 4.30); אהב (vv. 2, 25, 33); רעה (vv. 19, 33); מאס (v. 37; cf. 4.30). Note also the reoccurrence of the Egypt/Assyria-couplet (vv. 18, 36b). Cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Der aufmerksame Leser von Kap. 2 wird an den Zusammenhang V. 20ff. zurückdenken"; p. 179.



But the passage introduces also a few new items to YHWH's confrontation, such as the charge of social transgressions (v. 34) and the first explicit reference to Jerusalem's looming collapse (v. 37). Set within this mix of old and new discourse elements, 2.33-37 contains two speech quotations attributed to Jerusalem. While the frequency and distribution of the insets in 2.35 is quite different from the dynamics in 2.20-25, the questions of placement and interrelationship are again crucial in our analysis. Peculiar on its own terms, the special location of the two quoted phrases in the medial verse of the unit comes into focus even more strongly when the distinct structure of 2.33-37 is taken into account. As intimated in our text analysis in chapter three, the internal arrangement of these five verses is defined by a double-sequence of the initial particle *מה* which is followed each time by two subsequent uses of *גם*:

v. 33a	<i>מִה־תִּטְבִּי</i>	<i>מִה־תִּזְלִי</i>	v. 36a
v. 33b	<i>לִכֵּן גַּם אֶת־הָרָעוֹת</i>	<i>גַּם מִמַּצָּרִים</i>	v. 36b
v. 34a	<i>גַּם בְּכִנְפֶיךָ</i>	<i>גַּם מֵאֵת</i>	v. 37a

Although the sequence *גם* + *מה* is attested in a few passages elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> the particular constellation of the two parallel movements in 2.33-37 is unique. As we will see in our discussion, the relationship between 2.33-34 and 2.36-37 extends beyond syntax and repetition to matters of content and argumentation. The deliberate shape of this unit deserves a detailed analysis in its own right. Similar to our approach to the trans-temporal configuration of 2.4-9, we will begin our discussion with some preliminary observations about the two insets which involves their phrasing, interrelationship, and integration within 2.35. To determine their contribution to the communicative strategy that unfolds across

---

2. The closest parallels appear in 1 Sam 10.11 (*מה/הגם*), Ps 133.1 (*מה/מה/גם*), and Joel 1.18 (*מה/גם*). For sequences of two or three *גם*-clauses, see Christo H. J. van der Merwe, "Another Look at the Biblical Hebrew Focus Particle *גם*," *JSS* 54 (2009): 315-316, 320.

2.33-37, this analysis will be followed by a discussion of the גמ/גמ/מה-frame which incorporates the results of our study of 2.35.

## 2. The Insets in 2.35

Couched between the elaborate two-movement structure of 2.33-37, the content and arrangement of 2.35 exhibits its own intricacies. In order to discern the framing dynamics within this verse, we will analyze first the two insets and then correlate our observations with YHWH's central declaration in 2.35b.

### 2.1. Phrasing and Perspective

Like the three units we have discussed in the previous chapters, 2.33-37 also contains more than one speech quotation. Marked and separated by their respective *verba dicendi* (וַתֹּאמֶר/עַל-אֶמְרָךְ), the two insets attribute the following phrases to Jerusalem:

v. 35a	כִּי נִקִּיתִי	I am certainly innocent!
	אֲדָ שָׁב אַפּוֹ מִמֶּנִּי	Surely, his anger has turned from me!
v. 35b	לֹא חָטֵאתִי	I have not sinned!

In the first inset, we find once again a two-part structure of a brief exclamation and subsequent exposition (cf. vv. 25b, 31b). While the two expressions in 2.35a $\alpha$  and 2.35a $\beta$  differ in their length and formulation, both are phrased in a decidedly assertive manner (כִּי/אֲדָ). Whether Jerusalem speaks about herself (נִקִּיתִי) or about YHWH (אַפּוֹ), she is absolutely convinced about the veracity of her statements. The Niphal of נקה usually refers to freedom in a forensic sense, that is, of being innocent before the law,<sup>3</sup> yet it also occurs in Jeremiah and other

---

3. Cf. TLOT 2:763-767; NIDOTTE 3:152. From the twenty-five attestations of נקה (Ni.), its use in Proverbs especially reveals this nuance, for instance, in relation to adultery (6.29) and false witnesses (19.5, 9); see further the legal obligations attached to oaths (Gen 24.8, 41; Zech 5.3). Overholt points to Ps 19 in which a similar 1cs-declaration (וְנִקִּיתִי מִפֶּשַׁע רָב, v. 14) is set in a

books in contexts that denote freedom from YHWH's punishment. All of these passages, however, utilize the verb in a negative sense (לֹא + נָקָה) in order to emphasize that there is no freedom, no excuse, and no escape from the divine judgment.<sup>4</sup> The assurance of legal innocence and juridicial immunity that we encounter in Jerusalem's first inset marks a notable exception.<sup>5</sup> While a full evaluation of her statement must await our analysis of 2.33-34, the fact that such self-declarations (נִקְיָתִי) appear elsewhere only on the condition of YHWH's provision (חֲשֵׁךְ עֲבָדֶיךָ, Ps 19.14) or in a state of presumptuous revenge (Jdg 15.3) already casts doubt upon her words.

The second and longer portion of the inset in 2.35a seeks to consolidate this self-portrayal. The combination of אָחַז and שׁוּב is attested in three other places in Jeremiah, yet just as נָקָה, each of these passages is phrased in negative terms: YHWH's wrath will *not* turn away (cf. 4.8; 23.20; 30.24).<sup>6</sup> Throughout the Hebrew Bible, the appeasement of YHWH's anger is shown to be possible only by an obedient response (e.g., Josh 7.26; Num 25.4; 2 Chr 12.12) or by divine grace (cf. Isa 12.1; Hos 14.5). Since neither of these is indicated here, the assured outlook (אָחַז) of Jerusalem's declaration is questionable. Moreover, while the second part of the inset is meant to affirm the first, in reality it accomplishes the

---

context that exalts YHWH's law, precepts, and commands (cf. vv. 8-15); "Problem," p. 272.

4. All seven appearances of נָקָה (Ni.) in Proverbs occur in this negated phrase. In Jeremiah, YHWH assures Judah (25.29) and Edom (49.19) that they will not go unpunished (+ לֹא נָקָה; both with additional נָקָה inf. abs.). In Isa 3.26, we find Jerusalem post-punishment: her gates mourn, she has been punished (וְנִקְתָּהּ) and sits on the ground. Overholt's decree of the fictitious nature of 2.35a relates to the unnatural quality of the expression: "In what historical context would such a claim make sense? . . . Jeremiah is here more parodying his opponents than accurately quoting them"; "Problem," p. 272.

5. Jerusalem's first quotation neither expresses a "schlechtes Gewissen" (Krüger, "Götter," p. 188), nor does it reflect "die Anerkennung einer gewissen Schuld" (Giesebrecht, p. 14). The inset appears in Crenshaw's category "Confidence in God's Faithfulness" (cf. *Conflict*, p. 26); yet, all that the quoted words demonstrate is an air of self-assurance: Jerusalem's confidence is not rooted in YHWH, but in herself. Cf. Craigie: "Here the proclamation of innocence seems to be genuinely ignorant. . . the guilty party really believed that nothing would happen;" p. 44.

6. This is affirmed by the twenty-one affirmative announcements in the book (e.g., 4.26; 15.14; 21.5) which echo other prophetic texts (e.g., Isa 5.25; 9.11, 16, 20; 10.4).

exact opposite: if she was as blameless as she asserts, why would YHWH's wrath have *to turn* from her?<sup>7</sup> A statement such as “surely his wrath *will not come* on me” may have been in line with her opening declaration. Yet, as the phrasing of her words exposes rather than diminishes her guilt, the first inset reveals her as self-deluded and self-contradictory.<sup>8</sup>

The second inset, which is framed as the final element of 2.35, continues this portrayal. Parallel to the short, self-confident, and negative assertions in 2.23 (לֹא נִטְמָאֲתִי), Jerusalem again declares her uprightness before YHWH: “I have not sinned.” This statement mirrors her words in 2.35a and contradicts all related formulations throughout the rest of the book. The verb חָטָא, used fifteen times in Jeremiah, occurs only in YHWH's accusations of his sinful people (16.10-11; 32.25; 40.3; 44.23; 50.7, 14) or in their communal admission of their sins (חָטָאנוּ; cf. 3.25; 8.14; 14.7, 20).<sup>9</sup> In fact, neither in Jeremiah nor anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible is the denial לֹא חָטָאֲתִי ever directed to YHWH.<sup>10</sup> Like her claim of innocence, the declaration of sinless behaviour either identifies her as an exceptionally upright character or, what is more likely considering the previous discourse, reveals that the self-assuredness of her words is grounded on deliberate deception or delusion.

The two insets in 2.35a emerge as a complementary pair of a positive (“I

---

7. Cf. Schmidt: “Die Äußerung weist implizit oder indirekt auf eine frühere Zeit zurück, in der Gott seinem Volk zürnte”; p. 98.

8. McKane's translation (“It is certain that his anger has passed me by”; p. 54) eclipses this negative characterization. None of the major lexicons gloss שׁוּב as “to pass by” (cf. *DCH* 8:273-274; *HALOT* 4:1429-1431; *TLOT* 3:1312-1317; *BDB*, p. 996-1000). For McKane's rendition one may have expected עָבַר or בּוֹא as the verb in 2.35a.

9. Biddle's analysis of these confessions (“They acknowledge guilt and embrace responsibility”) demonstrates just how contrary Jerusalem's words are; *Polyphony*, p. 27.

10. Confessions of sin in the 1cs-form of חָטָא can be found regularly (see, e.g., Exod 9.27; Num 22.34; Jos 7.20; 1 Sam 15.24-30; Mic 7.9; Ps 41.5; 51.4), yet the denial לֹא חָטָאֲתִי occurs only in Jephthah's message to the Ammonite king (Jdg 11.14) and in David's speech before Saul (1 Sam 24.12).

am innocent”) and a negative (“I have not sinned”) assertion which jointly articulate a high degree of confidence but also a high degree of illusion. Inasmuch as the attributed words depict Jerusalem as utterly assured of herself, the contradictory phrasing in 2.35a and the dubious uniqueness of her estimations about YHWH’s wrath and her sin undermine their validity. At the root of her questionable self-reliance lies the egocentric perspective which is reflected across the insets. As in 2.20-25, everything that is placed on her lips focuses only on her own actions and character (נְקִיתִי/מִמֶּנִּי/חָטָאתִי). Again there is no address, no response, no dialogue. Jerusalem only talks about herself and if there is any reference to YHWH at all, this is only in the third person (אֵפוֹ).<sup>11</sup>

## 2.2. Integration

From these observations about the insets’ phrasing and interrelationship, we now turn our attention to their integration within 2.35. Placed at the opening and final position in the verse, the comprehensive perspective of self-affirmation and self-declared sinfulness is structured around YHWH’s words in an A/B/A’ structure:

A	וְתֹאמְרִי	כִּי נְקִיתִי אֵד שָׁב אֵפוֹ מִמֶּנִּי
B	הִנְנִי נִשְׁפָּט אוֹתָךְ	
A’	עַל-אֶמְרֶךְ	לֹא חָטָאתִי

Similar to the object lesson of the irrational animals (vv. 23-25) and the accusation of Israel’s turning (v. 27), this framing construction utilizes the quotations to demonstrate and affirm the statement set in between them. Our study of the insets has already raised doubts as to the veracity of Jerusalem’s words, yet it is ultimately YHWH’s speech at the centre of the verse that

---

11. This form appears in the Vulgate in direct address (*furor tuus*). It remains difficult to determine whether this deictic change presents a correction towards a dialogical structure or, as Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein claims, is due to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*; cf. “Textual Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah,” *Textus* 7 (1969): 51.

undermines her self-assuredness. Her assertive tone collides with YHWH's emphatic declaration (הנה) and all her talk about freedom from legal obligations, punitive consequences, and divine wrath is countered by his resolve to enter into judgment with her.<sup>12</sup>

In the accumulation of forensic language that dominates the frame-inset relationship in 2.35, Jerusalem's quoted words provide a self-incriminating foundation for the authority and accuracy of YHWH's announcement. This framing tactic is fueled by her questionable assertions and YHWH's judicial overthrow and becomes apparent in the relative speech proportions and the formulation of the final *verbum dicendi*. While the verbal dominance that is attributed to Jerusalem supports the portrayal of her self-centredness—her quotations add up to eight words, YHWH speaks only five—all of her words indirectly support YHWH's position. As more of her speech is presented, the more she is shown to entangle herself in contradictions and unfounded assurance.

Consequently, it is her words themselves that are identified as the reason for YHWH's announcement (על-אמרך). Her self-declared innocence is exposed by YHWH's judgment, her self-assuredness is countered by YHWH's legal prerogative, and the veneer of her self-absorption is penetrated by YHWH's direct address (אותך). Subordinated to the frame of divine authority and

---

12. For הנה, see, e.g., T. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985), pp. 137-140; Berlin, *Poetics*, pp. 91-95. The combination הנה and שפט (Ni.) is unique. The lexeme שפט frequently occurs in correlation with juridical terms, such as צדק, אמת, דין (cf. *NIDOTTE* 4:214). From the four attested Ni. part., especially Isa 59.4 (צדק/אמונה) and Prov 29.9 indicate legal connotations (Isa 66.16 and Jer 25.31 focus instead on YHWH's universal judgment [לכל-בשר]). YHWH's wrath (אף) is explicitly connected to his judgment (שפט) in Ezek 7.3, 8, and 35.11. Of special note is Jdg 11.27 where the assertion לא-הקטאתי is juxtaposed with YHWH's judging discernment (ישפט יהודה). As in all its other occurrences, the combination שפט + את denotes YHWH's resolve to *enter* into judgment rather than its execution or completion; cf. 1 Sam 12.7; Isa 66.16; Ezek 17.20; 20.35-36; 38.22; Joel 4.2; Prov 29.9.

exposure, the configuration of 2.35 bases Jerusalem's negative characterization not on her deeds or failures, but on the tone, content, and combination of her words. Her quoted declaration of innocence and sinlessness is phrased and framed in order to accomplish the very opposite of her assertions and serves ultimately to expose and condemn her.

### 3. The Frame of 2.33-37

After these preliminary comments on the quotations in 2.35, we turn our attention now to their role within 2.33-37. More specifically, we are interested in their integration and contribution to the peculiar גמ/גם/מה-configuration that defines this unit. Our discussion so far has elicited a number of questions that can only be answered by studying the two insets in this frame; for instance, how does the *verbum dicendi* that opens 2.35 and the quotation that it introduces relate to the previous two verses? Why does Jerusalem assert her innocence so strongly and what exactly has triggered YHWH's wrath and declaration of judgment? Given the parallel structures of 2.33-34 and 2.36-37, we also need to answer how the characterization that is advanced through the quotations relates to these two movements and to the progression of the unit as a whole.

Although virtually—and surprisingly—without any recognition in studies and commentaries on Jer 2, the גמ/גם/מה-structure in 2.33-37 has been elevated by Lundbom to “one of the most fully and intricately balanced in the book.”<sup>13</sup> The accuracy of this description can be seen in the opening phrases of the two movements:

v. 33a	מִה־תִּטֵּבִי דֶרֶךְךָ	How well you make your way
	לְבַקֵּשׁ אֱהָבָה	to seek love!
v. 36a	מִה־תֵּזֶלִי מְאֹד	How much you go about

---

13. *Rhetoric*, p. 74. See also the treatment in Lundbom's commentary (p. 294).

In addition to the syntactical parallels of the exclamatory particle *מה*, the 2fs-verbs, and the Piel infinitive constructs *לְבַקֵּשׁ* and *לְשִׁנוֹת*, the two lines also share the lexeme *דֶּרֶךְ*. After the parallels of *גַּם* and the verbs *לְמַדְתָּ* and *בִּשְׁתָּ* in 2.33b and 2.36b, verses 2.34 and 2.37 likewise correspond to one another. To the matched opening of *גַּם* + preposition (*בְּכִנְפֶיךָ/מֵאֵת*) and the inversion of *כִּי/לֹא* across 2.34b and 2.37b that Lundbom has detected, we may further add the parallelism of *בְּכִנְפֶיךָ* and *וַיְדִיךָ* and the sound pair *-צָאוּ* and *-צָאִי* in 2.34a and 2.37a. Adding to this the symmetrical A/B/A'-structure which we detected in 2.35, Lundbom's high esteem for the compositional equilibrium of 2.33-37 can only be upheld.<sup>14</sup> While it is difficult to deny that these structural parallels are an essential element for the understanding of this passage, their significance and function are yet to be determined.

### 3.1. The First Movement (2.33-34)

As in 2.20, the present unit also opens by directing a referentially unspecific statement to Jerusalem. In 2.33a, however, the focus rests not on YHWH's liberating love, but on the city's efforts "to seek love" (*לְבַקֵּשׁ אֶהֱבָה*).<sup>15</sup> Apart from YHWH's address to the prophet in 1.12 (*הֵיטִבְתָּ לְרֵאוֹת*) and the promise of restoration in 32.40, this is the only place in Jeremiah where the Hiphil of *יִטַּב* appears as a positive, commending statement.<sup>16</sup> Yet, fronted by the particle *מֵה*

14. In view of this structure, any speculations about the secondary nature of 2.36-37 are unfounded; see, e.g., Wanke, p. 45; Schmidt, p. 99; Rudolph, p. 19; Herrmann, p. 158; Volz, pp. 30-32. The internal cohesion of 2.33-37 also undermines Biddle's amalgamation of 2.25b and 2.33a into one verse; cf. *Redaction*, pp. 48, 56.

15. For *מֵה־יִטַּבְתָּ יְרֵכָךְ*, see Zehnder, *Wegmetaphorik*: "JHWH wirft seinem Volk vor, dass es sein ganzes Streben, sein Tun und Lassen (דֶּרֶךְ), darauf richtete, Liebschaften zu suchen"; p. 532.

16. Elsewhere in the book, *יִטַּב* (Hi.) appears either in YHWH's call for a change of



and placed subsequent to Jerusalem's transition from loving YHWH (אַהֲבַת, v. 2a) to loving strangers (בִּי־אַהֲבַתִּי זָרִים, v. 25b), this applause is obviously one of sarcasm and accusation.

As in its previous occurrences in 2.1-3.5 (cf. especially 2.23b), the lexeme דָּרַךְ and the nonspecific love-language in this verse have often been explained as indicators of cultic infractions.<sup>17</sup> However, if YHWH's addressee is identified as the personified city and if the evident parallels with the Egypt/Assyria-couplet of 2.18 (cf. מֶה + infinitive absolute) are taken into account, it is more fitting to understand the דָּרַךְ-idiom in 2.33 as a reference to political alliances.<sup>18</sup> Seeing that 2.36, the corresponding verse to 2.33, identifies the previously unnamed lovers as Egypt and Assyria, the symmetrical arrangement of the unit further substantiates this reading.<sup>19</sup>

This interpretive manoeuvre via the parallel configuration of these two verses offers a preliminary impression of how 2.33-34 and 2.36-37 are related. Far from merely echoing each other for the sake of structural artistry, the interplay between the two movements presents itself as a dynamic of specification: the first part provides a basis of generic information which is then extrapolated by its corresponding statement. As an apt manifestation of these dynamics, the second part of 2.33 continues in the unspecific vein of the opening

---

behaviour (הִיטִיבוּ דְרָכֵיכֶם, cf. 7.3-5; 18.11; 26.13; 35.15) or in negative statements about his people (4.22; 13.23) or idols (10.5).

17. So, e.g., Duhm ("Buhlerei mit den Baalen"; p. 31), Bright (p. 16), Wanke (pp. 44-45), Weiser (p. 28), McKane (p. 55), Rudolph (p. 18), Lundbom (p. 295), Herrmann (p. 159), Craigie (p. 43).

18. Cf. Hardmeier, "Redekomposition": "Besonders aus Jer 2.18 und 36 geht die politische Konnotation eindeutig hervor. Von daher sind auch die weiteren Vorkommen in 2.33 und 4.18, aber auch 6.27 auf das politische Verhalten zu beziehen"; p. 28. So also Zehnder, *Wegmetaphorik*, p. 539.

19. Cf. Lundbom, *Rhetoric*: "The structure of the poem forces a connection between A and A' suggesting that Israel's love affair is with Egypt"; p. 75. His commentary, however, upholds the opposite ("The 'love' they seek is within the fertility cult and/or prostitution"; p. 295). For the interpretation of the "lovers" in 2.33 as nations, see already Targum (לְאַתְחָבְרָא לְעַמְמֵי), and also Calvin (p. 139), Hitzig (p. 20), Volz (p. 31), and Allen (p. 50).

assertion and depicts the result (לִכְן) of Jerusalem's pursuits. Her striving after other lovers has led her to commit evil with such frequency and intensity that it has become a deeply ingrained habit. Although YHWH had warned the city earlier of the chastising effects of her evil (רעה, v. 19), now she is depicted as accustomed to her wicked deeds and is accused of seeking to improve on them by repeated exercise.<sup>20</sup> The character of her vicious deeds (אֲתֵּדְרָעוֹת), however, remains just as unspecific as the condemnation of her efforts. Once again a frame of quoted speech in 2.1-3.5 opens with a generic and strongly negative portrayal of the quoted speaker.

Mounting another depiction of Jerusalem's extreme behaviour on top of this incriminating characterization, the גג-clause in 2.34 introduces the topic of social oppression. The verse reinforces the accusation in 2.33 by means of a particularly vivid description of Jerusalem's atrocities. Not just on her hands (cf. Jer-LXX: ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου) but even on the hem of her clothes can the blood of her victims be found.<sup>21</sup> There is some mention of the social standing of those who have fallen prey to her, yet no information is supplied about how or why the city has committed her crimes.<sup>22</sup> As previously seen in the discourse of 2.1-3.5,

---

20. Cf. McKane: "You have made yourself into an expert at evil doing"; p. 53. This accusation corresponds with the negative connotations of לָמַד (Pi.) throughout Jeremiah: YHWH's people fail to receive his teachings (32.33) and are reproved for teaching themselves and each other to lie (9.4) and to follow Baal (9.13; 12.16); see further the indictment of Jerusalem's false friends in 13.21. The only positive use appears in YHWH's promise of restoration in 31.34.

21. While it is clear to see how the reading in Jer-MT (בְּכַנְפֵּיךָ) could have given rise to Jer-LXX (כֶּף/כַּנֵּף: ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ; cf. Isa 1.15), the direction of possible influence cannot be determined. Both readings are feasible (so, e.g., Rudolph, p. 18), yet the rendering in Jer-MT suits YHWH's exposure in 2.33-34 much better (cf. Cornill: "MT ist weit kräftiger"; p. 28).

22. Because of the verbal link with יָקַם נָקִי, some interpreters have suggested the massacres by Manasseh (2 Kgs 21.16) or Jojakim (2 Kgs 24.4) as possible background for this accusation; cf. Wanke, p. 45; Lundbom, p. 295. Duhm thinks that the victims are those of human sacrifices (p. 31; Biddle's discussion points in a similar direction; cf. *Redaction*, p. 44). In view of the generic character of 2.33-34, however, proposals regarding the historical referent of these atrocities remain in the realm of speculation. Cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Woran der Verfasser denkt, wenn er vom 'Blut der Unschuldigen' spricht, sagt er leider nicht. . . Erneut bleibt die Anklage

YHWH's allegations and descriptions do not relate to specific acts or events. Instead, structured by the repeated use of **גם**, his address in 2.33-34 serves to highlight just how far Jerusalem has strayed off the path: *even* to evil deeds she has grown accustomed, *even* on her clothes are the marks of her atrocities.<sup>23</sup> In order to excel in her search for love, the blood-splattered city has utterly exceeded all bounds of reasonable behaviour.

Designed to provide a fuller picture of this excess, 2.34b draws an intriguing parallel to the law of theft and punishment in Exod 22.1 which we have already encountered in 2.26a. Contrasting the previous example, however, YHWH's addressee in 2.34 is not analogous to the criminal, but to his murderer. According to Exod 22, if a thief is killed as he is found breaking in (**אִם-בַּמִּתְחַתֵּר** in **יָמָצָא**), there is no blood guilt for the person who killed him (**אֵין לוֹ דָּמִים**). While the verbal connections are apparent in our passage, their application and referents are significantly altered: Jerusalem did *not find* her victims committing burglary (**לֹא-בַמִּתְחַתֵּר מָצְאָתִים**), and yet their blood (**דָּם נִפְשׁוֹת**) *is found* on her clothes (**בְּכִנְפֶיהָ נִמְצָאוּ**). By means of this creative reformulation around the keywords **מצא** and **דם**, the victims' innocence and vulnerability (**אֲבִיּוֹנִים נְקִיִּים**) is given additional prominence which in turn accentuates the magnitude of Jerusalem's atrocities.<sup>24</sup> But the point is not merely that she is guilty of killing

---

ganz allgemein, ohne jegliche historische Verbindung"; pp. 181-182.

23. There has been some debate whether the primary function of **גם** is additive (so Muraoka, *Emphatic*, pp. 143-146; cf. WOC §16.3.5a) or emphatic (so Labuschagne, "The Emphasizing Particle *GAM* and its Connotations," in *Studia Biblica et Semitica* [FS Th. Ch. Vriezen; eds. W. C. van Unnik and van der Woude; Wageningen: Veenman en Zonen, 1966], pp. 193-203). While van der Merwe attributes to **גם** primarily an additive force (cf. *MNK* §5.2i), he refers to it as a "focus particle," that is, as a marker of "the most salient information in terms of the total amount of information in that clause"; *MNK*, p. 358 (glossary). Beyond this pragmatic function, he has stated elsewhere that **גם** serves in 2.34 also to indicate a "shift in topic"; "Particle," p. 327.

24. Since **אֲבִיּוֹנִים** is not represented in Jer-LXX, several exegetes delete it; see, e.g., Duhm (p. 31), Rudolph (p. 18; cf. *BHS*), Holladay (p. 56), and Allen (p. 46). The reason for this minus in the Greek version, however, may stem just as well from a deliberate omission of a redundant item than from a different *Vorlage*. For Fischer (p. 175), the doublet in 2.34 presents a "typisch jer Verdichtung." This accumulation serves here to highlight the magnitude of Jerusalem's

blameless people.<sup>25</sup> Rather, the legal adaptation goes to show that it is not her blood being shed because of her just punishment but instead the blood of her innocent victims. By means of this inversion, the image of the blood-splattered murderer emphasizes the bizarre and excessive nature of Jerusalem's crimes. Stained by her indelible guilt (2.22), the visible mark of her evil deeds affirms the initial character sketch of the deeply corrupted city who has long lost her innocence and operates in categories far beyond good and evil.

### 3.2. The Insets in 2.35

This fronted portrayal of Jerusalem and YHWH's exposition of her pursuits and evil leads us to the two speech quotations in 2.35. That the insets are tightly linked to 2.33-34 can be seen in the concessive phrase that closes 2.34b ("Yet, in spite of all these things") and the keyword connection between the innocent victims (נְקִיִּים) and Jerusalem's declaration of innocence in 2.35a (בִּי נְקִיִּיתִי).<sup>26</sup> While our study of the phrasing and interrelationship of the quotations has already cast doubts on Jerusalem's self-assuredness, the frame of 2.33-34 produces the conviction that not one of her words can be taken at face value. Evidently, the murder of innocent people (נָקִי) eradicates her self-proclaimed innocence (נְקִיָּה) and her habitually evil profile overthrows her assertion of being free from sin.

The concessive link between frame and quotations makes just that

---

atrocities.

25. So, e.g., Fishbane, *Interpretation*, p. 314.

26. Pace Liwak who takes 2.35 to be a prosaic addition to the poetry of 2.33-37 on the questionable basis of stylistic differences ("fehlender Parallelismus"); *Geschichte*, p. 178. While Wolff has left no comment on the quotations in 2.35, the נָקִי/נְקִיָּה connection would make a suitable entry in his discussion of "Stichwortverknüpfung von Zitat und Jahwewort"; cf. "Zitat," pp. 91-92.

point, yet it can offer only a partial impression of the full opposition between her deeds and her words. Framed against the accumulative rhetoric of the polemic *מה*-exclamation and two *גם*-clauses, the verbal façade of self-assurance and self-righteousness in 2.35 goes far beyond mere disparity. The portrayal of the city as trained in all wickedness, the disproportionate adaptation of the law code, and the visible evidence of the bloodstained garment magnify the audacity of her declarations. Seeing Jerusalem act in the way she is portrayed and then hearing her speak the words attributed to her is shocking and inexplicable, far beyond categories such as lying or ignorance.<sup>27</sup> The sheer magnitude of the disproportion between framing portrayal and quoted words affirms her deeply ingrained evil nature and fully demonstrates her self-delusion.

This particular construction between 2.33-34 and the insets in 2.35 provides strong support for YHWH's direct announcement of judgment. Already a hollow declaration, Jerusalem's assurance that YHWH's anger has turned from her crumbles under the weight of her portrayal. Far from setting her free, the deep-rooted corruption of the city and her destruction of innocent lives accelerates the mechanics of divine judgment.<sup>28</sup> The relationship between the legal language in 2.35 (*שפט, חטא, נקה*) and the readapted law code in 2.34 provides further justification for YHWH's forceful advance. Particularly the interlocking keyword dynamics of *מצא* and *נקי/נקיה* expose and condemn the city: the people are not found to be criminals, but Jerusalem's crimes are found out; the blameless did not deserve their fate, but Jerusalem will have to bear her blame. Her self-declared freedom from sin and punishment (*לֹא חָטָאתִי*) is compromised in this way through her disproportionate violation of the legal

---

27. Cf. Weiser: "Fast noch erschütternder als diese hemmungslose Grausamkeit des Verbrechens ist die Frechheit, mit der man es wagt, sich als schuldig zu erklären"; p. 29.

28. The shedding of innocent blood (*דם נקי*) appears in Jeremiah and elsewhere several times as a reason for YHWH's condemnation; cf. Deut 27.25; 2 Kgs 21.16; 24.4; Isa 59.7; Jer 7.16, 19.4, 22.3, 17; Joel 4.19; Ps 106.38.

statute. As her verbalized egocentricity becomes all the more apparent in her obvious disregard for others and as her quoted words collide in such proportions with her actions, YHWH's resolve to enter into judgment with the city is not only justified but long overdue.<sup>29</sup>

### 3.3. The Second Movement (2.36-37)

The quotations confirm the negative characterization that fronts 2.33-37 and vindicates the first explicit announcement of judgment in 2.1-3.5. Placed in the pivotal position in the unit, Jerusalem's quoted insets also contribute to the dynamics of specification to which we have referred in our discussion above. Now that the quotations have shown the full extent of Jerusalem's corruption, YHWH's successive announcements become markedly more detailed and also more aggressive. As we turn now to 2.36-37, we will see immediately that the focus of YHWH's address has shifted from providing a basis for judgment to spelling out in detail what this judgment will entail.<sup>30</sup>

While the frame of 2.33-34 has already undermined all of Jerusalem's words in 2.35, the reference to her striving for protection in 2.36 provides a scathing, *post eventu* denouncement of her assertions: if she was innocent and not under the threat of YHWH's anger, why would she have to search for protection?<sup>31</sup> In relation to the generic and polemic accusation against Jerusalem's efforts in 2.33a (מִהֲתִיטְבִּי), the corresponding exclamation in 2.36a

---

29. Cf. Hardmeier detects here "eine neue Stufe der Dramatik. Jahwe sieht sich jetzt dazu herausgefordert, mit seiner Stadt ins Gericht zu gehen (V. 35)"; "Redekomposition," p. 29.

30. Cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Die Beschuldigung drängt zur Präzisierung, die auch in V. 36 und V. 37 vorgenommen wird"; p. 179.

31. This has been pointed out helpfully by Keil: "Trotz seiner stolzen Sicherheit aber sucht Juda durch eifriges Betreiben von Bündnissen sich gegen feindliche Angriffe zu sichern"; p. 55.

(מִהֲתָזֵלִי) significantly nuances her political pursuits. The unique combination of דָּרַךְ + שָׁנָה identifies her running after the nations as an unprecedented affair (cf. מִוֶּרֶךְ [Hi.] + אֱלֹהִים in v. 11) and it also exposes the unreliability of her newly acquired allies. Reminiscent of the headless animal in 2.23-25, it further depicts Jerusalem's indiscriminate and unstable behaviour, asserting that she runs to and fro from one to the other (cf. מִשְׁרָכֶת דֶּרֶכֶיהָ, v. 23b).

This is displayed immediately with reference to Assyria and Egypt who, as argued above, specify the generic lovers of 2.33. As in 2.14-25, the Egypt/Assyria-couplet is again employed in the rhetorical manoeuvre of correlating the city's coming fate with the nation's past (בְּאִשָּׁר). Just as Israel and, by extension, Jerusalem, has suffered humiliation from its political aspirations with Assyria (בְּשִׁתָּה), so the city will be ashamed by her current pursuit of Egypt (תִּבְוֹשִׁי).<sup>32</sup> All her efforts and changing allegiance will not help; even (גַּם) this nation will disappoint her.

Based on the accusations in 2.33-34 and the demonstrative contribution of the speech quotations, this comparison articulates YHWH's first specific description of the contours of the city's judgment.<sup>33</sup> Jerusalem will be shamed by her disappointed trust and hopes in Egyptian assistance (cf. 37.6-10) and the resulting enemy takeover. These events are even more embarrassing in view of the historical precedent that YHWH had set before her. Yet, due to her self-centred and delusional attitude, Jerusalem is bound to repeat the degrading events of the past. The details about Jerusalem's shameful demise and the increasingly menacing tone of YHWH's address affirm the pivotal function of the quotations: once Jerusalem's framed words confirm and intensify the portrayal of 2.33-34, the path is paved for presenting the profile of YHWH's wrath without

---

32. For the complex comparative dynamics of 2.36, see McConville, *Promise*, pp. 32-33.

33. Pace Allen: "The gist of vv. 33-35 is repeated with more political information"; p. 50.

restraint.

The dynamics of growing specificity and severity culminate in the final verse of the unit. YHWH's announcement in 2.37 provides an illustration of the shameful manner of Jerusalem's collapse (וַיִּדֹּד עַל־רַאשֶׁהָ), but it also specifies its format.<sup>34</sup> Although many exegetes understand the locative phrase מֵאֶת זֶה as a reference to Egypt (i.e., "from *there* you will come out"), the notion of a shameful march (תַּצֵּא) and other indicators makes it more likely that deportation and displacement are in view.<sup>35</sup> In the progressive development of the unit and by virtue of being the final verse in Jer 2, this reading provides a fitting and fateful conclusion of the discourse. Diverting from the accumulative force of 2.33-34, the final גַּם-clause in the unit is therefore best rendered emphatically: "Yes, you will go out from here!"<sup>36</sup>

The assurance of Jerusalem's ultimate downfall is grounded (כִּי, v. 37b) in YHWH's rejection of her allies.<sup>37</sup> Although this statement corresponds to the first line of the unit, it is a serious understatement to say that "the poem ends much the way it began."<sup>38</sup> Far from repeating the same accusation, YHWH's

---

34. Holladay (pp. 111-112) and Allen (pp. 50-51) draw attention to the inner-biblical parallel of Tamar's humiliation in 2 Sam 13.19 which employs the same phrase (וַיִּדֹּד עַל־רַאשֶׁהָ).

35. For מֵאֶת זֶה as a reference to Egypt, i.e., to a failed ambassadorial visit, see, e.g., Cornill, p. 30; Carroll, p. 139; Biddle, *Redaction*, p. 41. Yet, the phrase וַיִּדֹּד עַל־רַאשֶׁהָ can be understood as a reference to captivity (so, e.g., Clements, p. 29; Craigie with referral to Egyptian wall reliefs; pp. 44-45), the rendering in Jer-LXX (ἐνταῦθεν) also denotes "from here" (cf. 38.10 [Jer-LXX: 45.10] where ἐνταῦθεν represents מִזֶּה), and the verb form תַּצֵּא is used for the exile of Jerusalem also in Mic 4.10: כִּי־עָתָה תִּצְאִי מִקְרִיָּה וְשָׁכַנְתָּ בַּשָּׂדֶה וּבָאת עַד־בָּבֶל.

36. While גַּם focuses the attention on its adjacent constituent ("from Egypt/from here"), it does not simply add another element to YHWH's account. Rather, it fulfills a climactic function, appropriate to the pronouncement of exile; for rhetorical גַּם, cf. *WHS* §380. When conjoined to a postpositive inf. abs., גַּם marks elsewhere the "climax of a series of situation"; *WOC* §35.5.1f. Allen (p. 50) translates both גַּם-clauses in 2.36-37 with emphatic "Yes."

37. Once again the discourse does not permit speculations about the historical background; cf. Liwak, *Geschichte*: "Auch an dieser letzten Stelle des 2. Kap geht der Text nicht in Details"; p. 183. The unreliability of Jerusalem's rejected allies (מְאֻסֵּי יְהוָה) become later apparent in their rejection of her (cf. 4:30: מְאֻסֵּי־בָדֶךָ).

38. Cf. Lundbom, *Rhetoric*, p. 75.



announcement in 2.37 provides a specific and severe counterpart to the exposure of Jerusalem's pursuits in 2.33. This dynamic progression across the two movement of the unit also manifests itself in the inversion between 2.34b and 2.37b:

v. 34b	לֹא־בִמְחֶתֶרֶת מְצָאִים בִּי עַל־כָּל־אֵלֶּה	בִּי־מָאֵס יְהוָה בְּמִבְטָחִי וְלֹא תִצְלִיחִי לָהֶם	v. 37b
--------	--	--	--------

As indicated by the reversed combination of **לֹא** and **בִּי**, the accusation leading up to the pronouncement of YHWH's judgment now corresponds to the specific contours of the judgment itself: in the same way in which there was no help for the innocent whom Jerusalem killed, there will now be no help for her. The development that is indicated here by verbal and syntactical correspondence is also reflected phonetically (**צָאֵ/צָאוּ**) across 2.34a and 2.37a. Jerusalem is found guilty with innocent blood on her garments (**נִמְצְאוּ**), YHWH therefore declares the ultimate punishment of displacement (**תִּצְאֵי**).

To sum up: our analysis has shown that the peculiar **גַּם/גַּם/מָה**-sequence, yet virtually not considered in previous studies, is essential for understanding this 2.33-37. Well beyond a merely artistic arrangement, the relationship between the nonspecific accusations in 2.33-34 and their explicit counterparts in 2.36-37 articulates a rhetoric of growing specificity and severity.<sup>39</sup> Progressing along two parallel movements, Jerusalem's political partners are unmasked, her pursuits and wickedness are shown to be beyond equal, the consequences of her deeds are given a full description, and the escalating charges climax in the emphatic declaration of the last verse. The generic accusations of the unit's first part depict why YHWH's judgment is necessary;

---

39. The argumentation of 2.33-37 is an ideal demonstration for the "rhetoric of descent" which Lundbom has detected in many other poems in Jeremiah. The descent can unfold in several aspects, such as from figurative to literal, from general to specific, and from abstract to concrete; cf. *Rhetoric*, p. 116.

the second part shows in menacing detail what this judgment will be like. Jerusalem awaits a shameful and unstoppable act of punishment which will bring all of her self-assuredness and exorbitant atrocities to an end.

#### **4. Conclusion**

In more ways than one, our analysis of the speech quotations in 2.33-37 has affirmed our observations from the previous units. Again we found the insets deeply integrated into the syntactical and lexical dimensions of their frame (cf. vv. 27b-28), again they were located at a crucial juncture of the discourse (cf. vv. 4-9, 23-25), and again they evinced important nuances in their interrelationship (cf. vv. 6-8, 27). The apparent correlation of Jerusalem's words and her victims (נקה/נקי), the quotes' pivotal position in the unit, and the comprehensive perspective that they advance within 2.35 all affirm our contention that quoted speech must be analyzed in its framing context. This is not to suggest that the study of the semantics and syntax of the quotations themselves is not important. On the contrary, our analysis of the legal terminology (חטא/נקה) and Jerusalem's declarations about YHWH's wrath have demonstrated just how insightful an examination of the insets can be. Yet, if these findings are isolated from their natural environment, many important questions remain unanswered and many suspicions lack support. When the communicative subordination and framing of the quotations is not recognized, it is impossible to grasp their contribution to the discourse.

The גם/גם-מה-structure that encloses the insets in 2.33-37 and also their correlation to YHWH's authoritative declaration at the centre of 2.35 has made apparent the accuracy of Sternberg's exposition about the formative influence of the frame. With regard to the fronted material of 2.33-34, the

constructed disproportion between Jerusalem's bloodstained atrocities and her brazen declaration of innocence affirms the portrayal of her excess and evil. Concerning the rhetoric of 2.36-37, the comprehensive perspective of self-affirmation ("I am certainly innocent!") and denial ("I have not sinned!"), her communicative aloofness towards YHWH, and her unwarranted assurance about his wrath lay the foundations for the harsh climax of shame and deportation. Placed in the pivotal position between the corresponding structures of specification and intensification, the quoted words of Jerusalem are utilized to advance and justify the progression from divine accusation to divine action, from exposure to execution, from legal jargon to lethal judgment.

As in the quotations in 2.20-25, the phrasing and framing of the insets in 2.33-37 serves to confirm YHWH's portrayal of Jerusalem as a deeply corrupted character. His descriptive accounts of her international affairs and her evil deeds are combined with the demonstrations of her attributed words in order to provide a comprehensive impression of her self-centredness. Framed within the deliberate progression of the two *גם/גם/מה*-movements, the accused city talks past the bloody evidence and past the authoritative judge and speaks only about herself and in affirmation of herself. Because of this scenario and because the evil of her self-centred pursuits has had its first victims, the turn in YHWH's speech from engagement to enforcement is presented as the only feasible option.

While the quoted words of YHWH's addressees have previously been framed in the justification of his accusations (see, e.g., vv. 8-9, 23-25, 29-32), nowhere has the bond between speech and judgment been drawn closer than in the present frame-inset constellation. More than anything else her words manifest the excessive and self-serving character of her actions and so it is only appropriate that they are employed as an explicit justification for YHWH's judgment: Jerusalem must be judged *because* of her speech (*על-אמרה*). As we

now turn our attention to the final unit of 2.1-3.5, this resolution is confirmed by an even more audacious verbal escapade of the city.



## Chapter Eight - The Speech Quotation in 3.1-5

- 3.1      לֹא־מָר הוּא יִשְׁלַח אִישׁ אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ      So: if a man sends off his wife  
                  וְהִלָּכָה מֵאִתּוֹ      and she goes away from him  
                  וְהָיְתָה לְאִישׁ־אַחֵר      and becomes the wife of another man,  
                  הֲיָשׁוּב אֵלֶיהָ עוֹד      can he return to her again?  
                  הֲלוֹא חֲנוּף תַּחֲנוּף הָאָרֶץ הִיא      Would not that land be utterly polluted?  
                  וְאַתָּה זָנִית      And you, you have whored  
                  רַעִים רַבִּים      with many partners!  
                  וְשׁוּב אֵלַי נְאֻם־יְהוָה      Can you return to me? —Speech of YHWH—
- 3.2      שִׂאֵי־עֵינֶיךָ עַל־שָׂפָיִם      Lift up your eyes to the open country  
                  וּרְאֵי אֵיפָה לֹא שֻׁגְלָתָ      and see: where have you not been raped?  
                  עַל־דַּרְכֵּימָם יֹשְׁבֹתָ לָהֶם      On the ways you have sat for them,  
                  כַּעֲרָבִי בַּמִּדְבָּר      like an Arab in the wilderness.  
                  וְתַחֲנוּפִי אָרֶץ      You have polluted the land  
                  בְּזִנוּתֶיךָ וּבִרְעֻתְךָ      with your evil whoring.
- 3.3      וַיִּמְנְעוּ רַבָּבִים      The showers were withheld  
                  וּמִלְקוֹשׁ לֹא הָיָה      and the rains have not come.  
                  וּמִצַּח אִשָּׁה זֹזְנָה הָיָה לָךְ      But you had the forehead  
                  מֵאֲנָתָה הַכֹּלֵם      of a whoring woman,  
                       you refused to be ashamed!
- 3.4      הֲלוֹא מַעַתָּה      Have you not then  
                  קָרָאתִי לִי אָבִי      called out to me: “My Father!”  
                  אֲלוֹף נַעֲרִי אַתָּה      The partner of my youth are you!
- 3.5      הֲיִנָּטֵר לְעוֹלָם      Will he remain angry perpetually,  
                  אִם־יִשְׁמַר לְנֶצַח      even keep his fury forever?”  
                  הִנֵּה דִבַּרְתִּי      Behold, you have spoken,  
                  וַתַּעַשׂי הָרָעוֹת      and you have done evil things  
                       אֵלֶיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר יָכָלְתָּ      as much as you could!

### 1. Introduction

The final unit that we will discuss in our case study depicts yet another speech by YHWH to Jerusalem, the female recipient of his words already in 2.14-25 and

2.33-37. In addition to this linkage via the shared 2fs-address, the continuity of this discourse scenario is confirmed by recurring themes and elements from the previous city-sections.<sup>1</sup> Despite the growing intensity of YHWH's address across 2.20-25 and his declaration of judgment at the close of Jer 2 (cf. הִנְנִי נִשְׁפָּט אוֹתָךְ, v. 35), the discourse of 3.1-5 opens with the question of reconciliation (שׁוּב occurs twice in v. 1). Yet, before long the focus of YHWH's speech turns back to the familiar topics of Jerusalem's illicit behaviour and refusal (vv. 2-3). The unit then comes to a close with another quotation of the city and YHWH's response (vv. 4-5).

Compared to the previous frame-inset configurations, 3.1-5 contains only one quoted phrase. Since this utterance shifts from direct address (אָתָּה, v. 4b) to a third-person account (הִיא, v. 5a), some exegetes have postulated two separate insets or have assigned 3.5a to YHWH.<sup>2</sup> The frame itself, however, offers no indication of different speakers and it is not unusual for prophetic speech quotations to extend across two adjacent verses.<sup>3</sup> In view of the clear break between the 2fs-*verbum dicendi* קָרָאתִי (v. 4a) and the 2fs-verb דִּדְרַתִּי (v. 5b) which refers back to the quotation, the segment of 3.4aβ-5a is identified in its entirety as one quoted inset. The notable shift within the quotation from talking *to* YHWH to talking *about* YHWH requires a different explanation which

---

1. These were discussed in our argument for including 3.1-5 in our study (see "Demarcation" in chapter three).

2. Cf. Shields, *Circumscribing*: "The two questions attributed to the people in vv. 4-5a are punctuated as separate questions because of the switch from second to third person. These questions may represent two speakers or simply two quotations of the people from two different contexts"; p. 35. Duhm understands 3.5a "als Frage Jahwes an das Weib"; p. 35. However, this reading undermines the discourse function of הִנָּה in 3.5b and one would also expect 1cs-verbs in 3.5a. As McKane has shown (p. 62), the versions likewise struggle with the shifting communication structure in 3.4-5. While Jer-LXX (διαφυλαχθήσεται) reads a pass. verb for יִשְׁמֹר in order to make Israel the subject ("Will it [i.e., Israel] be kept for ever?"), Targum (/לִדְרַתִּי) and Vulgate (irascere/preseverabis) harmonize the verb with the 2mp-pronoun אָתָּה of 3.4a. Glanz overlooks this shift: "Again in vv. 4b-5a YHWH is in the 2pPos and the people in the 1pPos;" *Shifts*, p. 313.

3. Cf. Isa 10.8-11; 14.13-14; 30.10-11; 38.10-11; Jer 5.4-5, 12-13; 25.5-6; 32.3-5; 35.6-7; Amos 8.5-6; Mal 3.14-15.

we will seek to provide in our discussion. However, before we can examine the quoted words themselves, the arrangement of the unit demands that we begin our analysis with 3.1-3, the framing discourse prior to the inset. Having analyzed the perspectives and communicative strategies which are formulated in this opening section, we will then offer a detailed treatment of the phrasing, internal constitution, and framing of the inset in 3.4-5a and relate our findings to YHWH's final declaration in 3.5b.

## 2. The Frame of 3.1-3

We have already encountered connections to pentateuchal legal material in some of the previous units and the present discourse poses yet another such parallel in its opening verse. Since the adaptation in 3.1 is quite complex and since its fronted position in the unit exerts a crucial influence on the discourse of 3.2-3 and the quotation in 3.4-5,<sup>4</sup> it demands a detailed treatment.

### 2.1. Law and Lust (3.1)

As in the case of the statute of Exodus 22 and the incriminating profiles of theft (2.26a) and murder (2.34) that were derived from it, a close comparison between 3.1 and the law code of divorce and remarriage from Deut 24.1-4 again evinces significant variations. Phrased as a casuistic scenario of marital relations (בִּי־יָקָח אִישׁ אִשָּׁה), Deut 24.1-4 opens by supposing that the woman, for some sexually connoted, yet unspecified reason,<sup>5</sup> has lost favour with the man and is

---

4. This influence is already suggested by the two intertwined keyword chains which connect 3.1-3; cf. חָנוּף תַּחֲנוּן/וַתִּחַנֵּן, vv. 1-2; וָנִית/בְּזוּתִיד/אִשָּׁה זֹנָה, vv. 1-3.

5. The enigmatic phrase עָרוֹת דָּבָר occurs only in one other passage (Deut 23.15) where it is likewise not specified. Fishbane has offered a helpful discussion in this regard and concludes that "there is little doubt that it carries a clear sexual component"; *Interpretation*, p. 309. Whatever the phrase denotes, there is general agreement that it does not refer to adultery; so, e.g., McConville, *Deuteronomy* (AOTC; Leicester: Apollos, 2002), p. 358; Duane L. Christensen,



sent off (וְשִׁלְחָהּ) with a letter of divorce. She goes away (וְהִלְכָה) and marries another man (לְאִישׁ־אַחֵר, v. 2), yet this second marriage also comes to an untimely end, either because of the man's death or because he hates her and sends her off just like her first husband (וְשִׁלְחָהּ, v. 3). The scenario concludes with the prohibition that the first man is not allowed to turn and take his wife back (לָשׁוּב לְקַחְתָּהּ) because this would be an abomination before YHWH and it would "cause the land to sin" (תַּחֲטִי'א אֶת־הָאָרֶץ, v. 4).<sup>6</sup>

At first sight, 3.1 appears to replicate this law exactly. Again the discourse is couched in casuistic terms (הֵן) and again the progression unfolds along sending off (וְשִׁלְחָהּ), going away (וְהִלְכָה), and remarriage (לְאִישׁ־אַחֵר). Beyond these parallels, however, the remainder of the verse betrays significant differences to the formulation of the law code.<sup>7</sup> Presupposing that these differences are deliberate,<sup>8</sup> we note on the formal level that the blunt prohibitions of Deut 24.4 have been transformed into questions: "Can he return

---

*Deuteronomy 21.10-34.12* (WBC 6B; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2002), p. 566. Jeffrey H. Tigay prefers a more general assessment: "Any conduct the husband finds intolerable"; *Deuteronomy: The JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1996), p. 221.

6. Of its thirty-four occurrences, the Hi. form of חטא appears predominately (×27) in 1-2 Kings with a "bad king" as subject and Israel or Judah as object (so also Jer 32.35). Its use in connection with ארץ in Deut 24.4 is unique and emphasizes, according to Shields, "the integral connection between behaviour and land"; *Circumscribing*, p. 30.

7. Cf. Craigie: "Beyond these general points, it would be unwise to press the opening analogy"; p. 51. So also Carroll (p. 143) and Allen ("The parallel is a loose one"; p. 54)

8. The relationship between the two texts has been debated. While some exegetes think that both have derived independently from an older law (e.g., T. R. Hobbs, "Jeremiah 3.1-5 and Deuteronomy 24.1-4," *ZAW* 86 (1974): 23-29; Rudolph, p. 21; J. Schabert, "Jeremia und die Reform des Joschija," in *Livre*, p. 45), others suppose that Deuteronomy's record has served as a *Vorlage* for Jeremiah (e.g., Fishbane, *Interpretation*, p. 308; McConville, *Promise*, p. 34; Holladay, p. 112). J. D. Martin has concluded that this issue "must remain an open question"; "The Forensic Background to Jeremiah 3.1," *VT* 19 (1969): 90. Evidently, it is impossible to determine, let alone prove, whether the author of 3.1 drew from Deuteronomy or some other text or tradition. However, it is noteworthy that the interrelationship between Deut 24 and Jer 3 does not only consist of identical terms, but of identical terms *in identical order*. If possibly not in written form, the standardized and narrativial character of the legal statute would make a replication via memory a feasible option. In her study on Jeremiah's use of priestly legal traditions, Rom-Shiloni ("How can you say?," p. 775) has drawn attention in this regard to David M. Carr's work. Especially Carr's overview of the "memory variants" in the Book of Proverbs poses a parallel to the repetition-and-variation scenario of Deut 24.1-4 and Jer 3.1; cf. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Construction* (New York: OUP, 2011), pp. 25-37.

to her again? Would not that land be utterly polluted?” While the lexemes שׁוֹב and אָרֶץ keep the focus on the legal statute, this shift to the interrogative mode moves the discourse to a new direction. The questions draw in their recipients and, if they attempt to respond, force them to affirm the legal mandate: no, the man cannot return; yes, the land would be horrendously polluted.<sup>9</sup>

Similar to the rhetorical use of previous questions (e.g., 2.5, 17, 28, 32), the double interrogative-construction in 3.1a (הַיִּשׁוּב . . . הָלֹא) also functions as a set-up for YHWH’s subsequent accusations.<sup>10</sup> The particular constellation of questions and content in 3.1a, however, has a different function than the previous interrogative rhetoric. Since YHWH’s pointed questions are not related to personal affront (cf. 2.5, 29) or memories of the past (cf. 2.14) but to the authoritative sphere of public law, they endow his arguments with a strong legal anchorage.<sup>11</sup> Mounted upon this unshakeable foundation, the first part of 3.1 establishes YHWH as an authoritative speaker and affirms the absolute prohibition of reunion after divorce and remarriage.

After this introduction, which remains as nonspecific regarding addressee and application as the openings of 2.14-19 and 2.26-28, YHWH turns directly to Jerusalem. By virtue of the conjunctive, fronted address in 3.1b (וַיֹּאמֶר), the city is perceptually linked to the legal discourse and, by implication, cast into the role of the divorced woman. Yet, what YHWH has to say to her does not match the legal scenario: she has not been divorced by her husband, but has

---

9. The combination of אָרֶץ + חָנָה is rare (cf. Num 35.33; Isa 24.5; Jer 3.9; Ps 106.38). Moreover, as Fischer has pointed out (p. 185), this is the only inf. abs. of חָנָה in the HB. For similarities and differences between חָטָא (Deut 24.4) and חָנָה (Jer 3.1), see Shields, *Circumscribing*, p. 43.

10. For Burke O. Long, the questions “lay a rhetorical basis for indictment”; “Stylistic Components of Jeremiah 3.1-5,” *ZAW* 88 (1976): 387. He refers to similar dynamics in 2.11, 8.4-5, 13.23, and 18.14-15.

11. Cf. Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*: “Juristische’ Argumentation”; p. 190.

acted as an unfaithful whore (זִנִּית); she has not married another man, but has had many partners (רָעִים רַבִּים).<sup>12</sup>

This *non sequitur* is noteworthy on various levels. It shows that 3.1 does *not* state that YHWH has divorced Jerusalem. In contrast to Deut 24.1-4, the relational collapse is caused by unfaithfulness and the “letter of divorce” (סִפְר כְּרִיתָהּ), featured twice in Deut 24.1-4, is nowhere mentioned. If the divorced woman cannot be equated with Jerusalem, it follows that it is inaccurate to see YHWH as the divorcing husband.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, the legal scenario of 3.1a should not be regarded as an analogy for the marriage between YHWH and the city but rather as a rhetorical foil: if reunion is already impossible for lawfully divorced partners, how much more for a lawless, whoring woman like Jerusalem!<sup>14</sup>

That the framework of spousal relationship has been utterly eclipsed by Jerusalem’s outrageous behaviour comes into focus more explicitly through two further variations between 3.1 and Deut 24.1-4. First, it is noteworthy that the version in Jeremiah leaves out all of the negative descriptions of the woman: no

---

12. So, e.g., Rudolph: “Es handelt sich nicht um eine rechtmäßige Scheidung, sondern um Ehebruch”; p. 21. By itself, 3.1 does not allow for an identification of these partners (besides, none of the twenty occurrences of רָע in Jer refers to idols, gods, or nations; see, e.g., 3.20; 5.8; 6.21; 9.3-4; 19.9; 23.27-35; 34.15-17; 46.16). As in 2.20-25, the references are nonspecific; the focus rests on Jerusalem, not on her partners. Cf. Carroll: “It is not always possible to determine whether the text is referring to political, religious, or sexual activities (or to all three at once!)”; p. 142. For the generic sense of רָע, see also Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*, pp. 91-92.

13. So, e.g., Diamond and O’Connor, “Passions”: “Judgment comes in the form of an irreversible divorce. . . The marriage is over”; p. 131; Brueggemann: “Yahweh is the first husband. . . Judah is the faithless wife of Yahweh”; p. 42; Sienstra, *Husband*, pp. 165-166; Sohn, *Husband*, pp. 90-91; Nötscher, p. 49; Stulman, p. 54; Miller, p. 603. However, as Shields rightly observes “there is no divorce mentioned in vv. 1b-5”; *Circumscribing*, p. 40. For a superb comparison between *Bildebene* and *Sachebene*, see Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea*: “Es ist nicht davon die Rede, daß das zorn-treibende Gottesvolk von einem ‘ersten Mann’ weggelaufen oder von diesem gar rechtmässig verstossen wurde. Der naheliegende Analogieschluß, Jahwe als verlassenen Ehegatten des Gottesvolkes und entsprechend Israel als ungetreue Ehefrau Jahwes anzusprechen, wird ausdrücklich nicht gezogen! . . . Wie bereits in Jer 3.20 gelten auch in Jer 3.1 Jahwe und Israel nicht als ‘Ehepaar’”; p. 192.

14. Lundbom detects here a *kal vechomer* mode of argumentation (cf. *Rhetoric*, p. 38). So, e.g., also Duhm (“wie viel schlimmer”; p. 33), Moughtin-Mumby (“worse than the hypothetical wife”; *Sexual*, p. 99), Martin (“Forensic,” p. 92), Weiser (p. 32).

reference is made to her first husband's dislike, her deficiency, or the hatred of her second husband. Hence, the excessive and explicit characterization in 3.1b not only counters this portrayal, but overturns it altogether. Contrasting the immaculate woman in 3.1a, Jerusalem displays an inordinate lust and gives abundant reason for disgust and rejection. Second, while Deut 24.1-4 envisions an end of the woman's second marriage, either by the aversion or death of her husband, the quantity and indiscriminate character of Jerusalem's partners suggests that her sexual wantonness is an ongoing affair which will not be exhausted easily. If one lover hates her or leaves, she will simply run to someone else. As a result of this rhetoric of disproportion and excess, Jerusalem is introduced at the head of 3.1-3 as a character for whom the possibility of reunion and also the ability of faithfulness are entirely out of the question.

This portrayal prepares the phrase which closes 3.1 ("Can you return to me?"). It is only here in the last word of this long verse—only 2.6 is longer within 2.1-3.5—that YHWH enters the stage. Since 3.1 does not cast him in the role of the husband, this climactic self-reference is understood best as an emphatic depiction of the unbreachable divide between him (אֱלֹהִי) and the whoring city (זָנוּהָ).<sup>15</sup> As yet another departure from the statute of Deut 24, this breach is not depicted with the finality of the legal demand. In the transformation from prohibition to question, it is noteworthy that YHWH is not concerned with Jerusalem's potential return, but with his own return (הֵשִׁיב אֵלַיָּהּ).<sup>16</sup> In spite of

---

15. In the structure of 3.1b, these references to Jerusalem and YHWH stand at opposite ends of the line.

16. Several interpreters prefer the reading of Jer-LXX which identifies the woman as the subject in YHWH's first question (ἀνακάμψει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔτι). According to Rudolph (p. 20; cf. BHS), Jer-MT is a late correction toward Deut 24.4 (so also Duhm, p. 33; Cornill, p. 31; Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel. Viertes Band: Jesaja, Jeremia* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1912], p. 243). While Jer-MT poses the *lectio difficilior*, this correction overlooks that the referent אִשָּׁה is the primary agent throughout 3.1a (וְיָשְׁלַח); all phrases related to אִשָּׁה are subordinate elements (וְהִלְכָה/וְהִיָּתָה). See further the helpful

her horrendous conduct and against all legal and cosmic odds, the thought of reunion, it seems, has not yet vanished from YHWH's perspective. While a human husband would be more than justified to divorce and, in view of her unfaithfulness, even to execute a woman like Jerusalem (cf. Deut 22.22), YHWH supersedes this framework by suspending this prerogative.<sup>17</sup> What the authority of the law declares impossible is made yet more impossible by the city's excessive whoredom, but there remains a spark of hope because YHWH will not abandon his commitment and communication with her.

## 2.2. Exposition and Evidence (3.2-3)

This persistence is expressed immediately in 3.2. Reminiscent of 2.14-25, YHWH again attempts to open Jerusalem's eyes to the extent and consequences of her bizarre lifestyle. As previously, this strategy is pursued through a forceful double-call for visual recognition (שְׂאֵי-עֵינֶיךָ/וְרָאִי, cf. 2.19, 23). Based on the whoring-idiom in 3.1b (זָנִית), the rain cessation of 3.3a, and previous nature references (cf. 2.20b, 27a), most exegetes understand the locative referent שְׂפָיִם, often translated as "hills" or "high places," as an indicator for illegitimate cultic activities. Consequently, the verb שָׁגַלְתָּ is often said to point to the sexual rites involved in these activities.<sup>18</sup> Yet, not only it is far from clear what kind of geographical space the noun שְׂפָיִם describes, its use in Jeremiah and elsewhere gives absolutely no indication for a cultic setting.<sup>19</sup> Rather, in conjunction with

---

treatment by Holladay (p. 113) and Diamond and O'Connor, "Passions" (pp. 137-138).

17. Only a few interpreters connect 3.1 to the law of adultery of Deut 22.22; see, e.g., Nötscher (p. 49); Fischer (p. 185). Hardmeier refers to this as "einen doppelten Rechtsverzicht" and highlights "Jahwes übermenschliche Offenheit für eine Rückkehr seiner Stadt"; "Redekomposition," pp. 29-30.

18. See, e.g., Craigie ("sexual frolic that marked certain types of fertility cult"; p. 52); Lundbom ("Canaanite fertility worship"; p. 302); Nicholson ("cult of Baal with its fertility and sexual rites"; p. 42); McKane ("sexual rites associated with Canaanite cult"; p. 63). See further Volz (p. 37), Allen (p. 55), Bright (p. 23), Fretheim (p. 73), Wanke (p. 49), Rudolph (p. 21), Weiser (p. 33), Nötscher (p. 49), Schmidt (p. 103), Thompson (p. 192).

19. Whatever שְׂפָיִם denotes, McKane has demonstrated that "high places" must be

the locative question “Where have you not been raped?” and in parallelism with על־דִּרְכֵּי (v. 2aβ), the phrase על־שָׂפִים supports YHWH’s exposition of Jerusalem’s excessive affairs. Wherever she may look (שָׂאִי־עֵינֶיךָ),<sup>20</sup> both the open country and the places of public commute manifest the accuracy of YHWH’s זִנָּה-indictment in 3.1b.

A closer look at שָׂגַל further strengthens this argument against a cultic interpretation. The verb שָׂגַל occurs only three other times (Deut 28.30; Isa 13.16; Zech 14.2) and each time denotes the violent sexual assault on Israel’s women by invading enemies. Both Pinker and Moughtin-Mumby have rightly argued that in these texts renditions like “ravish” or “lain with” (following Qere: שָׁכַב) “reduce the shocking impact” of שָׂגַל; the verb must be translated more accurately as “to rape.”<sup>21</sup> Moreover, since all four שָׂגַל-passages list the euphemistic Qere שָׁכַב, the expression seems to carry a highly obscene and degrading quality.<sup>22</sup> Thus, instead of reflecting cultic activities, 3.2a enlists Jerusalem’s visible, widespread, and vulgar relations as a vindication of YHWH’s

---

rejected as a possible translation; “open country” or “countryside” are more likely; cf. “SPY(Y)M with Special Reference to the Book of Jeremiah,” in *Mélanges Bibliques et Orientaux en l’honneur de M. Henri Conzelles* (FS M. Henri Conzelles; AOAT 212; eds. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), pp. 319-335; Craigie quotes Ugaritic parallels in support of this conclusion (cf. pp. 49-50). The noun שָׂפִי occurs only nine times in the HB. In Isa 41.18, it is parallel with בְּקָעוֹת; in Isa 49.9, it stands as in Jer 3.2 with על־דִּרְכֵּי. In Jeremiah, none of the other occurrences indicates cultic connotations (cf. 3.21; 7.29; 14.6; 4.11 and 12.12 connect the word to the wilderness: שָׂפִים בְּמִדְבָּר). Only in Num 23.3 does שָׂפִי appear in the context of a sacrifice; yet, even here the reference is to a location *away from* the burnt offering.

20. Another reason for understanding שָׂפִים as cultic heights may be the command שָׂאִי־עֵינֶיךָ. Yet, this exact expression almost always indicates looking *around* (cf. “north, east, south, west” in Gen 13.14 and Deut 3.27; “north” in Jer 13.20 and Ezek 8.5; see further Isa 49.18 and 60.4 (שָׂאִי־סָבִיב עֵינֶיךָ); Gen 31.22; Zec 5.5. The only explicit references to looking *upwards* are in Isa 40.26 (מְרוֹם) and Isa 51.6 (לְשָׁמַיִם).

21. Cf. Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual*, p. 103. For a full overview of contemporary and ancient translations, see Aron Pinker, “On the Meaning of *šgl*,” *JSIJ* 8 (2009): 174-175.

22. In his detailed discussion of the “unmentionable” status of שָׂגַל, Pinker argues that the verb denotes, specifically, sodomitic rape: “Because the act was unnatural, painful, and performed at the anus, it was obviously so obscene that it merited a euphemism”; *ibid.*, p. 174.

sharp charge in 3.1b and in order to bring her to her senses.

While שגל points to the depths of vulgarity to which Jerusalem has fallen, it remains an expression of sexual violation, that is, of something that she suffers against her consent. The adjacent statement that she idly sits on the paths and awaits her lovers (וְשִׁבְתָּ לָהֶם, v. 2aβ) is then, to say the least, surprising. That it is the woman who pursues the men may be regarded as an ironic reversal,<sup>23</sup> yet since שגל labels her as a raped and humiliated victim, the rhetoric goes deeper than that. Further expounding the disproportional and absurd behaviour of Jerusalem's whoredom in 3.1, this peculiar juxtaposition depicts her as so deeply in the wrong about her actions and affiliations that she does not even realize the harm that they cause her. She is violated and exploited by her partners and yet she continues to run after them, offering herself for further liaison.<sup>24</sup>

This horrendous scenario explains YHWH's urgency to wake her up to her blind and self-destructive behaviour and it also justifies the accusation in 3.2b. Having demonstrated the full extent of Jerusalem's atrocities, the strong charge of her whoredom and evil, here blended into one, is entirely appropriate (בְּזִנוּתֶיךָ וּבְרָעָתֶךָ).<sup>25</sup> In fact, her conduct is of such a rampant character, that it has brought about the pollution of the land (וּתְחִיפֵי אֶרֶץ) which was previously only a hypothetical consequence (תְּהוֹי תְּחִיפֵי הָאֶרֶץ, cf. v. 1aβ). As the evil that comes from Jerusalem's pursuits not only harms herself but also the community (cf. הִרְעוּת in 2.33-34) and the cosmos, the possibility of return, already denied in 3.1, has

---

23. Cf. Brueggemann: "One would expect a lone woman on the road to be ambushed. But, shamelessly, the woman assumes the role of an ambusher"; p. 44.

24. I am indebted to Moughtin-Mumby for this interpretation; cf. *Sexual*: "She will prostitute with anyone, anywhere, even sitting around waiting to be raped!"; p. 106.

25. With reference to Watson (*Poetry*, p. 325), this phrase is read as a hendiadys also by Lundbom (p. 302). For other examples in Jeremiah of a hendiadys of two "ב + noun"-phrases in conjunction, see 7.24; 8.19; 19.9 (note the phonetic link!); 23.32; 32.21, 23; 33.5.

moved even further out of reach.<sup>26</sup>

As the frame of 3.1-3 comes to a close, this aspect of cosmic upheaval is unfolded in more detail. Like the references in 3.2, the cessation of the rains in 3.3 (וַיִּמְנָעוּ) has also been subjected to a cultic interpretation.<sup>27</sup> However, there is no explicit reference to idols or sacrifices and the pollution of the land may just as well have a different cause.<sup>28</sup> Consistent with the tenor of YHWH's argumentation, it is more likely that the drought is adduced here simply as tangible evidence which ought to convict Jerusalem of her trespasses. In her absurd bondage to her lovers, however, even the collapse of the seasonal cycle does not suffice to bring her back to reality.<sup>29</sup> Her rebellious and whoring demeanour (מִצַּח אִשָּׁה זוֹנָה) prevents her from opening her eyes to the humiliation which she suffers from her destructive allegiances (מִאֲנִיַּת הַכָּלִים).<sup>30</sup>

### 2.3. Conclusion

Our primary goal in the analysis of 3.1-3 was to detect the perspective and the communicative strategies that are established in the frame prior to the quotation in 3.4-5. Placed at the head of the unit, the legal argumentation

---

26. Cf. Vincenzo Lopazzo: "Nei vv. 2-3 il divieto del ritorno si giustifica con la gravità della condotta del popolo ed è resa ancora più vana la speranza di un eventuale ritorno"; "Ger 3: Forma, Contentu e Scopo," *Bi e Or* 43 (2001): 200.

27. See, e.g., Carroll: "The connection between harlotry and drought in v. 3 are ironic: the fertility cults of Canaan were designed to guarantee the cycle of nature"; p. 143. Lundbom (p. 304) draws a connection to the "YHWH vs. Baal" show-off in 1 Kgs 18.

28. In support of Moughtin-Mumby's assertion that we "must not simply assume that the land can only be 'polluted' by the cult" (*Sexual*, p. 105), we may turn to Num 35.33 where חָנַף אֶרֶץ + is linked to the shedding of innocent blood or to Isa 24.5 where it is the result of breaking Torah. Jerusalem's presence on ways and in the open country (v. 2) may possibly relate the cosmic collapse to her political and economic escapades.

29. The sound play between רָבִים (v. 1) and רַבְבִּים (v. 3) further tightens the connection between her affairs and its consequences; cf. Lundbom, *Rhetoric*, p. 38.

30. Note here especially the wider context of Isa 48.4 (וַיִּמְנָעוּךָ נְחוּשָׁה) and Ezek 3.7 (חֲזִיקִי-מִצַּח).



provides an authoritative foundation for YHWH as speaker and a platform for his rhetoric of disproportion. By means of the *non sequitur* of law, questions, and accusation, Jerusalem's departure from YHWH is described as excessive and as far beyond the realm of common legal principles. In human marriage, there are regulations and boundaries; yet her behaviour transcends all conceivable relational frameworks. At the same time, the modified marriage law provides a platform for presenting YHWH as acting beyond the norms of common human relations. There are no words for her scandalous behaviour and yet he continues to address the city and seeks to alert her to the dangers of her allegiances. Accumulating evidence in support of this strategy, 3.2 exposes her relations as widespread, vulgar, and indiscriminate and confronts her with the harmfulness of her pursuits. YHWH's address of 3.3 adds to this the tangible proof of climatic collapse, yet she still refuses to open her eyes. In the portion leading up to the speech quotation in 3.4-5, Jerusalem is thus depicted as utterly corrupted and blind to the personal damage and detriment of her departure from YHWH. Instead of yielding and trusting in his authoritative voice and instead of responding appropriately to the gracious suspension of his judgment, she disregards YHWH's exposition and continues to offer herself to whomever comes her way. Still, the notion of divorce is but a foil and in view of YHWH's open question in 3.1 and his continual communicative pursuit, the last word regarding reunion and judgment has not yet been spoken.

### **3. Frame and Inset in 3.4-5**

Against the background of these observations, we begin our analysis of Jerusalem's quotation with the question and particle in 3.4aα (הֲלוֹא מֵעַתָּה) and the *verbum dicendi* in 3.4aβ (קִרְאָתִי לִי) that precede it. After these framing elements have been discussed and related to 3.1-3, we will devote our attention to the phrasing and internal structure of the inset. YHWH's final word in 3.5b

will bring the discourse and also our analysis to its conclusion.

### 3.1. The Frame of 3.4a

As we continue our reading of the unit, the structure of 3.4-5 recalls the double-interrogative format that we encountered in the opening verse:

v. 1a	vv. 4-5a
הַיָּשׁוּב אֵלֶיהָ עוֹד	הֲלוֹא מַעֲתָה קִרְאתִי לִי אָבִי
הֲלוֹא חֲנוּף תַּחֲנוּף הָאָרֶץ הִיא	הֲיִנָּטֵר לְעוֹלָם אִם-יִשְׁמַר לְנֶצַח

This parallel lends support to our arguments for the unit's cohesion and progression, and it also demonstrates the integration of the quoted inset. Since we will reserve our comments on the second question (הֲיִנָּטֵר לְעוֹלָם) and its expansion (אִם) for the discussion of the inset below, it must suffice here to point out that this connection to 3.1 serves to reintroduce YHWH's authority. Placed firmly on the foundation that was established through the legal rhetoric, the questions in 3.4-5a confirm YHWH's assertion that Jerusalem has indeed called out to him in the terms attributed to her ("Have you not . . . ?"). By way of this parallel and the rhetorical structure of the question itself, the framing introduction of the inset preempts all attempts to deny her words. Having been unable to disagree with his convicting address in 3.1, his exposing challenge in 3.4 likewise leaves her no room for excuses.

Before discussing the *verbum dicendi* and the inset, it is worthwhile to examine the phrase מַעֲתָה more closely. As Böckler has argued, this syntactical connector marks a discourse break in the passage and, more specifically, a shift towards new behaviour.<sup>31</sup> Yet, as she herself submits, this understanding clashes

---

31. "Das Wort bezeichnet semantisch also eindeutig eine Handlung, die neu einsetzt"; *Vater*, p. 311; cf. Lundbom: "Some sort of 'about-face'"; p. 303. Böckler draws this conclusion from the use of מַעֲתָה in Isa 48.6, Dan 10.17, and 2 Chr 16.9. From its thirteen occurrences, מַעֲתָה

with the explicit statement in 3.3b that YHWH's addressee "eben gerade *nicht* zur Besinnung gekommen ist" (cf. מֵאַנֶּה הַכֶּלֶם).<sup>32</sup> While any interpretation of מֵעַתָּה will be to some extent contingent on the meaning that is assigned to the inset, Böckler's treatment seems to imply that a change in behaviour can only be a change for the better. Although מֵעַתָּה marks a point in time ("then") when Jerusalem spoke in a different manner to YHWH than before, the quoted words may well be coherent with the description of 3.3b, that is, they may still give evidence of a rebellious and absurd attitude. In fact, given what we have witnessed in the frame of 3.1-3, we might even expect the inset to continue in this vein. Before we consider this question in more detail, we will briefly attend to the *verbum dicendi*, the final framing element prior to Jerusalem's quotation.

We formerly noted that 3.1-5 stands out among the units of 2.1-3.5 because it records only one quoted inset; however, this final unit of the discourse also is distinguished by its use of קרא as the *verbum dicendi* (all previous frames used some form of אמר). In view of other קרא-quotations in the book (e.g., 3.19; 20.8),<sup>33</sup> but also because of the deictic, personal marker לִי and the direct appeal that opens the inset ("My father!"), the use of קרא instead of אמר instills a sense of urgency in Jerusalem's words: she does not merely speak to YHWH, but cries out to him.<sup>34</sup> Contrasting the quotations in 2.20-25 and

---

stands eight times with עַד-עוֹלָם in the liturgical formula "from now until forever" (cf. Ps 113.2; 115.18; 121.8; 125.2; 131.3; Isa 9.6, 59.21; Mic 4.7). As Volz (p. 35) and McKane (p. 61) have rightly argued, this literal translation ("from now") fits 3.1-5 neither temporally nor logically. Most interpreters and translations opt for "just now"; see, e.g., Duhm, p. 35; Fischer, p. 182; Lundbom, p. 298; NRSV; ESV; JPS. Rudolph's correction גַּם-עַתָּה ("gleichwohl"; p. 20; cf. *BHS*) remains but a guess. The rendition given here ("Have you not then") seeks temporal alignment with 3.2-5 which is set entirely in past tense; so also Craigie (p. 49) and Wischnowsky ("Hast du nicht von da an zu mir gerufen"; *Zion*, p. 131).

32. *Vater*, p. 310 (emphasis original).

33. For קרא as *verbum dicendi* in Jeremiah, see our discussion "Context and Identification" in chapter three above.

34. Across the lexicons, the usual glosses for קרא are "to call, shout, get one's attention"; cf. *TLOT* 3:1158-1164; *NIDOTTE* 3:971; *HALOT* 3:1128-1131. Speech which addresses its subject as אֲבִי often utilizes קרא (cf. Isa 8.4; Jer 3.19; Job 17.14; Ps 89.27). Meier's observation that קרא may indicate spatial distance between speaker and addressee follows in this vein (cf. *Speaking*,

2.33-37, the framing and, as we will discuss shortly, the phrasing (אָבִי/אָתֶּה) of the inset in 3.1-5 renders it the only quotation in 2.1-3.5 in which Jerusalem is not portrayed as speaking past YHWH, but directly and emphatically to him. In combination with the preparatory question and the indication of something new about to happen, this personal outlook of the *verbum dicendi* raises the expectation that Jerusalem may indeed show some kind of positive response to all of YHWH's communicative efforts. Whether or not this expectation is fulfilled, however, depends ultimately on her quoted words.

### 3.2. The Inset: Jerusalem's Appeals

The first part of the quotation divides into the short address of YHWH as אָבִי, the compound appellation אֱלֹהֵי נַעֲרִי, and the personal, direct pronoun אָתֶּה. Although the syntactical structure of this inset is far less complex than some of the previous instances, the combination of these four words has caused considerable interpretive difficulties. For exegetes who read 3.1-5 through the lens of an alleged marriage metaphor, Jerusalem's address of YHWH as father creates an obvious problem.<sup>35</sup> While there have been several attempts to remedy this discrepancy,<sup>36</sup> there is simply no compelling argument for

---

pp. 338-339).

35. Cf. Wischnowsky, *Zion*: "Mit der Aufrufung 'mein Vater' wird die Bildebene gesprengt"; p. 133. Due to the comments by Duhm ("אָבִי ist unverträglich"; p. 35), Volz ("ganz zerhackt"; p. 35), and Rudolph (pp. 21, 25; cf. *BHS*), it has become customary to recreate the supposed original unity of the father-language in 3.4 and 3.19-20 (D. Jobling, for instance, asserts that "almost no one denies that iii 1-5 and iii 19-20 form a single piece"; "Jeremiah's Poem in III1-IV2," *VT* 28 [1978]: 47; see also Thiel, *Redaktion*, pp. 83-93). However, this diachronic sketch is not without its problems (cf. Holladay, *Architecture*, pp. 47-51; Thompson, p. 193; Weiser, p. 38) and, as Böckler rightly comments, still fails to explain why אָבִי appears in 3.4 ("Das Problem wird nicht gelöst sondern lediglich verschoben"; *Vater*, p. 311).

36. Holladay (p. 115), for instance, omits אָבִי as a gloss because there is "no parallel in the OT for 'my father' as a wife's designator." Cornill thinks it is "eine schmeichlerische Bezeichnung des Gatten"; p. 32. McKane translates אֱלֹהֵי as "teacher" and understands אָבִי then as "the husband in his capacity as instructor of the young wife"; p. 62. Shields, for whom "the metaphorical language [in vv. 4-5a] assumes a loving, marital relationship," resolves the issues

understanding אב here in a different way than in 2.27a, namely, as a paternal referent. Hence, the first appeal that is placed on Jerusalem's lips depicts an intimate and emotional cry of a daughter to her father. There has been no indicator of a marital relationship between YHWH and the city in 3.1—or, for that matter, anywhere else in chapter 2—and neither can her emphatic אָבִי in 3.4 be interpreted in this way.

The perceived difficulty of the first part of the inset can be resolved rather quickly, however, the real problem with Jerusalem's quotation comes into focus when אֶלּוֹף נָעָרִי, her second appellation, is added to the discussion.<sup>37</sup> Many exegetes translate this referent as “companion” or “friend” and the use of אֶלּוֹף in Ps 55.14—parallel with כַּעֲרָכִי and מִיָּדַעִי—supports this choice.<sup>38</sup> In its other attestations, however, the noun seems to refer to somebody who is arguably more than just a friend. While the plural form אֶלְפִים in 13.21 may indicate an intimate relationship,<sup>39</sup> the text that carries the most weight in the discussion is Prov 2.17, the only other passage besides 3.4 that combines אֶלּוֹף and נָעוּרִים. In Prov 2, the benefits of Lady Wisdom are appraised which include, among other things, her protection from the “strange woman” (בְּאִשָּׁה זָרָה, v. 16) who lures men with smooth words (אֶמְרֵיהָ הַחֲלָקָה) and who abandons the “companion of her youth” (אֶלּוֹף נָעוּרֶיהָ, v. 17). This particular woman appears once more in Prov 7.5 where she is depicted in explicit terms as seducing young men in the

---

by way of hierarchy: “Perhaps the term [i.e., אָבִי] is one of deference used between a young woman and an older man”; *Circumscribing*, pp. 44, 65.

37. Leaving aside the homonymic use of אֶלּוֹף as “chief” (×43 in Gen 36; Exod 15.15; ×13 in 1 Chr 1.51-54) or “clan” (Zech 9.7; 12.5-6), we arrive at a corpus of nine passages. After exclusion of the adjectival use in 11.19 (כְּכֶבֶשׂ אֶלּוֹף = “like a pet lamb”; McKane, p. 256) and the plural form אֶלּוּפֵינוּ in Ps 144.14, which refers to cattle, the relevant texts besides 3.4b are 13.21; Mic 7.5; Ps 55.14; Prov 2.17; 16.28; 17.9.

38. See, e.g., Duhm (p. 35), Rudolph (p. 20), Holladay (p. 58), (Weiser, p. 30), Carroll (p. 141), Craigie (p. 49); *HALOT* 1:54; *DCH* 1:289.

39. Cf. Fischer: “Vertrauensverhältnis”; p. 462. Rudolph: “Traute Freunde”; p. 80; Nötscher: “Wie eine Dirne... Liebedienerei”; p. 121. See further the extensive overview by McKane, pp. 307-310.

absence of her husband (cf. vv. 5-27). Since this link and also the character profile are consolidated by the repeated reference to her seductive talk (cf. v. 5; see also v. 21: **בְּחֶלֶק שְׁפָתֶיהָ**), there can be little doubt that the “companion” whom she abandons in Prov 2.17 is not just a close friend but either her husband or one of her lovers.<sup>40</sup>

It is possible, though less likely, that the appearances of **אֶלּוּף** in Prov 16.28 and 17.9 and in Mic 7.5 denote romantic rather than platonic relationships;<sup>41</sup> however, this explicit parallel of the combined phrase in 3.4 and Prov 2.17 suffices to undermine the idea that Jerusalem’s quoted inset addresses YHWH purely in friendly terms. While the relational and sexual connotations that are associated elsewhere with her youth further support this suggestion,<sup>42</sup> what ultimately tips the scales is the frame of 3.1-3. If we consider her indiscriminate and excessive whoredom (v. 1), her vulgar pursuit of sexual relations (v. 2), and her stubborn disposition of unfaithfulness (v. 3), it becomes

---

40. So, e.g., Lundbom, p. 303; Christl Maier: “Untreue gegenüber dem Jugendgeliebten,” *Die “fremde Frau” in Proverbien 1-9: Eine Exegetische und Sozialgeschichtliche Studie* (OBO 144; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1995), p. 98; Richard J. Clifford: “V. 17 alludes to those whom the woman has earlier betrayed”; *Proverbs: A Commentary* (OTL; London: WJK, 1999), p. 48; see further Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), pp. 122-123, 231; Roland E. Murphy, *Proverbs* (WBC 22; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998), p. 16; Leo G. Perdue, *Proverbs* (IBC; Louisville, KY: WJK, 2000), p. 92; R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes* (AB 18; New York: Doubleday, 1965), p. 43; Tremper Longman III., *Proverbs* (BCOT; Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2006), pp. 123-124; Otto Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos* (2nd ed; BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003), p. 27; *NIDOTTE* 1:416; BDB, p. 441.

41. Both passages depict division (**פָּרַד**, Hi.) of two **אֶלּוּף**, either through murmur (**רָגַן**, Ni., Prov 16.28; cf. Longman, *Proverbs*: “Intimate associates”; p. 337) or undue lingering on a matter (Prov 17.9). Parallel with the phrase **אֶל־תֶּאֱמִינוּ בְּרַעַ** and succeeded by a list of family relations, Mic 7.5 (**אֶל־תִּבְטְחוּ בְּאֶלּוּף**) is followed by the reference “she who lies at your bosom” (**מִשְׁכַּבַּת חֵיקָךְ**) which may link **אֶלּוּף** to the realm of intimacy; cf. Hillers, *Micah* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1984): “Do not trust a lover”; p. 83; Waltke: “Your intimate friend”; *A Commentary on Micah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), p. 415.

42. The term **נָעָרִי** links 3.4 with 2.2 (**חֶסֶד נְעִירֶיךָ**) and Jerusalem’s love of her bridal days (**אֶהְבֶּת כְּלולָתִיךָ**). The discourse of Ezek 23 describes the young years of the city much more explicitly as a time of sexual escapades (vv. 3, 8, 19, 21; cf. Galambush, *City*, pp. 109-117). In Mal 2.14-16 “youth” and marriage are explicitly linked (**אִשָּׁת נְעוּרֶיךָ**). Elsewhere, youth is portrayed as a time of sin (**חַטָּא**, Ps 25.7) and iniquity (**עוֹן**, Job 13.26).

highly doubtful that she makes much of a distinction between friends and lovers. After all, YHWH's first direct words to her set זָנִית and רַעִים side by side (v. 1b). On the basis of the framing perspective that is established in 3.1-3 and in view of the sexual connotations of אֱלֹהִי and נַעֲרִי, the quoted phrase in 3.4 is even more shocking than all of the preceding descriptions. To demonstrate the depth of her perversion, Jerusalem is depicted as addressing YHWH in the same breath as her parent and her partner, as her father and her lover.<sup>43</sup>

While Israel had transferred YHWH's title of father to their lifeless idols (cf. אָבִי אֱתָה in 2.27), Jerusalem retains the proper designation but uses it in a deeply disturbing manner. Rather than forcing the two terms אָבִי and אֱלֹהִי נַעֲרִי into a marriage framework or understanding them as an innocent appeal to a father-friend figure,<sup>44</sup> the solution to the troublesome combination of Jerusalem's appellations is as shocking as it is straightforward. Although the extent of her excessive and perverted behaviour was already pushed beyond limits through the legal rhetoric of 3.1, this address moves her vulgarity to an even lower level. By placing on her lips two utterly incompatible terms side by side,<sup>45</sup> she is portrayed as denigrating her life-giver (cf. 2.21) to the rank of her many lovers whom she charms and changes as she sees fit. The strong expositions in 3.2 were still conceivable in the mouth of YHWH, yet an expression as inappropriate and foul as this must be dissociated from the divine

---

43. This twisted and appalling relationship recalls the scene of Lot and his daughters in Gen 19.20-35 which places the first occurrence of אָבִי in the HB on the lips of the older daughter: הָרָשָׁה בְּתוּרַי אָמַשׁ אֶת־אָבִי (v. 34a).

44. Moughtin-Mumby rightly advocates "to loose נַעֲרִי אֱלֹהִי from the binds of 'the marriage metaphor,'" yet her proposal to understand the phrase instead "to speak in parallel to 'My Father' of the relationship between father and child" fails to account for its sexual connotations; *Sexual*, p. 94. Moreover, that fathers, let alone YHWH as father, were considered as friends needs yet to be demonstrated. The nouns אָב and רַע, at least, are never correlated in the HB.

45. *Pace* Lundbom: "The metaphors overlap nicely"; p. 303. In Fischer's view, the quick shift from one address to the other may indicate "daß die Worte wenig ernst gemeint sind"; p. 187.

voice. The features of attribution and indirection that quoted speech so readily supplies allow for exactly this detachment without forfeiting the scathing denouncement.<sup>46</sup>

Far from indicating a change for the better, then, the inset expresses an appalling deterioration. While Jerusalem's words are framed as a direct response to strong accusations of refusal (מֵאַנָּה) and whoredom (זִוְנָה), they make no reference to them but only magnify these dimensions. Instead of opening her eyes to the issues which YHWH had exposed, Jerusalem attempts to entice him with a decidedly intimate and personal address (אֶתְּהָ).<sup>47</sup> She refuses his fatherly warnings, yet appeals to his relational commitment to her.<sup>48</sup> Her words, then, connect to the preceding accusations in 3.1-3 not by way of acceptance or submission, but instead as a disturbing scheme of self-defense. Prompted by YHWH's sharp words and faced with the first, tangible consequences of her deeds (v. 3a), Jerusalem's lure is a precautionary measure to ward off more drastic repercussions. She approaches YHWH as his devoted daughter and his coaxing lover, yet the framing friction between refusal (v. 3b) and passionate address (v. 4) and the correlation of drought and direct appeal exposes her despicable speech as a deceptive ploy. The only time that she is depicted in 2.1-3.5 as responding to the frame of YHWH's speech, she tries to frame him.

---

46. The unit of 3.1-5 thus utilizes quotation as a means for the "dissociation of responsibility" which we introduced as part of Clark and Gerrig's "Demonstrative Theory" in chapter three above.

47. The pronoun אֶתְּהָ appears for emphasis also in 17.14. Cf. Volz: "Die Häufung der persönlichen Wörter. . . malt das intime Verhältnis"; p. 38. Cf. Duhm: "Die Frechheit der Hure besteht darin, dass sie mit fremden Männern hurt und dennoch ihrem Ehemann mit Kosenamen schmeichelt, als ob nicht geschehen wäre"; p. 35.

48. With reference to the נִעֲרִידָה/נִעֲרִי connection between to 3.4 and 2.2, McKane comments that "she makes an appeal to Yahweh for old time's sake"; p. 61.



### 3.3. The Inset: Jerusalem's Questions

The motives behind this outrageous manipulation come into focus more explicitly in 3.5a, the second half of Jerusalem's quotation. As a noteworthy deviation from the parallels between the interrogative structures of 3.1a and 3.4-5a which we have noted above, this final question in the unit is not asked by YHWH, but by Jerusalem. Moreover, only in 3.5b is the initial question (הֲיִנָּטֵר) followed by another question (אִם-יִשְׁמֵר). After YHWH's interrogative onslaught throughout the unit, now the city herself begins to ask questions. Contrary to what 3.1-3 sought to promote, however, her inquiries are concerned neither with explanations nor do they portray a sobering self-assessment.

An explicit reference is absent (cf. אָפוּ in 2.35a), yet we can infer from the use of לְעוֹלָם + נָטַר and לְנֶצַח + שָׁמַר elsewhere that Jerusalem instead ponders the dynamics of YHWH's wrath and vengeance: will he remain angry perpetually, even keep his fury forever?<sup>49</sup> From all of its related passages, the phrasing of 3.5b recalls chiefly Isa 57.16a (כִּי לֹא לְעוֹלָם אָרִיב וְלֹא לְנֶצַח אֶקְצוֹף) and Ps 103.9 (לֹא-לְנֶצַח יָרִיב וְלֹא לְעוֹלָם יִטּוֹר). As both verses strictly deny that YHWH's anger is of a long-lasting kind, they indirectly confirm his forgiving disposition as articulated, for instance, in Exod 34.6, Mic 7.18, and also in Jer 3 itself (כִּי-יִחַסֵּד v. 12).<sup>50</sup> Informed by these parallels and in the service

---

49. In Lev 19.18 and Nah 1.2, נָטַר is paralleled with נָקַם; in Ps 103.9, the parallel is רִיב. The expression לְנֶצַח occurs with קָצַף (Isa 57.16), אָף (Ps 74.1), אָנִי (Ps 79.5), and חֲמָה (Ps 89.47). Note further the references to Isa 57.16, Jer 3.12, Am 1.11, and Ps 103.9 which are mentioned in our analysis. These passages make Rudolph's emendation unnecessary ("zu נָטַר und שָׁמַר ist אָף zu ergänzen"; p. 20).

50. The only passage that speaks of unrelenting anger refers not to YHWH, but to Edom (וַיִּטְרֹף לְעַד אָפוּ וְעִבְרָתוֹ שָׁמְרָה נֶצַח, Am 1.11). In view of these parallels and the confessional character of 3.5a, several interpreters suspect that the inset reflects liturgical material; see, e.g., Shields, *Circumscribing*: "They reflect a cultic situation in which the people are praying to God"; p. 46. Similar Weiser ("Bundesfest"; p. 33) and Wischnowsky ("Praxis der Volksklage"; p. 133). While אָב appears in the communal confessions of Isa 63.16 and Isa 64.7 (cf. Böckler, *Vater*, pp. 277-291), neither Isa 57.16 nor any of the passages related to אֱלֹהִים indicate a liturgical setting. Moreover, the combination לְ + קָרָא appears only once in the Psalter with reference to YHWH (cf. Ps 57.3). If one would accept this hypothesis, however, the combination of Jerusalem's indecent speech with these liturgical confession renders her shameless behaviour all the more outrageous.

of the framing perspective of YHWH's fully justified, yet suspended judgment (see our discussion of 3.1), the quoted questions thus exalt YHWH as a God slow to anger and ready to pardon.

In view of these declarations throughout the Hebrew Bible, Lundbom has called the two questions in 3.5a rhetorical. There are, however, good reasons to doubt that affirmations of divine forbearance and forgiveness are their only logical answer.<sup>51</sup> Contrary to Isa 57, the statements about divine anger do not come from the authoritative voice of YHWH, but are attributed to Jerusalem. Contrary to Ps 103, they are not formulated as an affirmative credo, but as open questions. Moreover, especially the interrogative **אם/ה**-construction undermines the idea that Jerusalem's words are endowed with an unswerving confidence. Her accumulative questions are decidedly persuasive, seeking to force an answer rather than relying on YHWH's tolerance as a self-evident fact.<sup>52</sup> Since the structure and perspective of 3.5b is far from the solid conviction of divine declaration and public confession, the city is depicted as having a considerable lack of certainty regarding YHWH's forgiveness.<sup>53</sup> The phrasing of Jerusalem's speech is a vehicle upholding YHWH's forgiving character. At the same time, it highlights her doubtful disposition as to whether or not his forgiveness will apply in her particular case.

The repeated reference to YHWH's actions (**יָטָוּר/יִשְׁמֶר**) and the timing

---

51. Cf. Lundbom: "Everyone knows that Yahweh does not keep his anger forever"; p. 303. Brueggemann sees here a "generally accepted observation"; "Questions," p. 371.

52. The rhetorical strategy of mounting two similar question (**אם/ה**) in immediate sequence often appears in accusations or complaints and seeks to undermine the addressee's possibility to answer contrary to the speaker's allegations; see, e.g., Gen 37.8; Num 11.12; Jdg 11.25; Isa 10.15; 40.28; Jer 5.9, 22; 14.22; 18.14; 31.20; Ezek 15.3; 22.14; Amos 6.2, 12; Mic 4.9; Hab 3.8; Ps 77.10; 94.9; Job 4.17; 6.5-6; 10.4; 22.3.

53. Pace Allen ("Optimistic statement"; p. 55) and Trapp who lists 3.4-5 alongside the quotations of 2.20-25 under the category "Trust in self"; "Other Sides," p. 232.

of his anger (לְעֹלָם/לְנֶצַח) may present another manifestation of this uncertainty, yet its strongest indicator is found in the shifting communication structure to which we have alluded at the beginning of our analysis. Parallel to the sudden transposition from the familial and fondling tones in 3.4 to the fearful questions in 3.5a, the inset shows a shift from direct address to YHWH (יְהוָה, v. 4b) to speech about YHWH (cf. the two 3ms-verbs). Since we have identified her enticing appellations as a strategic means to appease YHWH, it is only fitting that she keeps her loaded questions to herself.<sup>54</sup> The personal address as daughter and lover is all he needs to hear; her rumination about wrath and judgment, however, cannot be brought up in conversation. They might blow her cover by showing her doubtful disposition, yet worse, they might receive a fateful answer. Her reluctance to speak openly betrays a guilty conscience which suggests in turn that YHWH would have every reason to unleash his anger.

What emerges, then, from our analysis of the quoted inset in 3.4aβ-5a is a complex character profile of Jerusalem who, in the depth of her indiscriminate and absurd disposition, presents herself before YHWH as daughter and lover in order to ward off her deserved punishment. Her private questions are not confident declarations grounded in her trust in YHWH;<sup>55</sup> on the contrary, they are attempts of self-persuasion which reflect her uncertainty regarding YHWH's disposition. Likewise, her appeals to him are not marks of sincere devotion but a shrewd strategy to cover up her doubts, move him to letting her off the hook, and ultimately, to continue on the path that 3.1-3 describes. As there is not even a hint of responsiveness to YHWH's exposition, the inset confirms the depiction

---

54. Cf. McKane: "The question (v. 5a) is not addressed to Yahweh; it is, perhaps, an unspoken question, one which Israel hardly dare formulate"; p. 63. Cf. Craigie: "The people's words in v 5a-b seem to be in the form of an aside. . . to reassure themselves"; p. 52.

55. *Pace* Böckler, *Vater*: "Israel scheint aus diesem Vertrauensverhältnis zu JHWH [i.e., as father] die Sicherheit gezogen zu haben, dass Gott 'nicht ewig zürnen' und nicht 'immerfort nachtragen wird' (Vers 5)"; p. 314.

of her rebellious and reckless character.

Framed by the exposition of her excess, lust, and evil, her quoted address to YHWH demonstrates that the city has crossed all boundaries of acceptable behaviour and speech. With regard to YHWH's character, the quoted questions serve as an indirect exaltation of his forbearance and communicative pursuit and in this way affirm the framing perspective of 3.1. At this point in the discourse, however, the sheer magnitude of Jerusalem's obscenity and deception more than justifies the suspension of his judgment coming to an end.

### 3.4. YHWH's Response in 3.5b

Having now attended to the phrasing, structure, and integration of the quotations within the frame of 3.1-3 and 3.4a, we conclude with YHWH's answer in 3.5b. Whereas in 2.20-25 the shameless and offensive words of Jerusalem had been placed as the closing element, in the final unit of 2.1-3.5, this role is reserved for YHWH. At the end of the discourse, only his word is heard and everything that came before must be understood in relation to this authoritative, final verdict.<sup>56</sup> As yet another indicator of the quote's integration, the two questions in 3.4-5a are followed—just as their counterparts in 3.1 (cf. וְאָתָּה)—by an immediate and forceful answer (הִנֵּה).<sup>57</sup> Appropriately concluding the unit, this answer brings together the three elements central to YHWH's address to Jerusalem: her speech (דְּבַרְתִּי), her evil deeds (וַתַּעֲשֵׂי הָרָעוֹת), and her excess (וַתִּגְבֹּל).

---

56. This summative function of YHWH's response is authorized by the הנה/הן-inclusio across 3.1-5. Cf. Lundbom, *Rhetoric*: "The final 'behold' brings the hearer back to the beginning"; p. 38.

57. As de Regt has shown, it is not uncommon that rhetorical questions occur with a direct answer; cf. "Rhetorical Questions," p. 54 (with reference to Hab 3.8 [ה/אם] and Jer 25.29). Since the verb דְּבַרְתִּי evidently relates to the quoted words, it is not necessary to re-point הִנֵּה as proposed, for instance, by Rudolph (p. 20), Bright (p. 19), and Volz (p. 35).

In connection to the rhetorical question in 3.4a, the first member of this triad functions as a framing confirmation that Jerusalem has in fact spoken the words attributed to her. Set between this framing bracket of former (“Have you not then called out to me”) and latter (“Behold, you have spoken”) affirmation, a denial of her words is rendered impossible. In the same way in which she cannot hide her public atrocities (cf. v. 2), her horrendous words are exposed. As Brueggemann has pointed out, the “evil things” (הָרָעוֹת) in 3.5b harken back to her evil whoring (וּבְרָעָתָהּ, v. 2b) and also to her many partners (רָעִים, v. 1b).<sup>58</sup> Integrated amidst these intersecting dimensions of her illicit conduct, Jerusalem’s perverted words are placed on par with her perverted deeds. This link manifested in the terse combination of 3.5b (דְּבַרְתִּי וַתַּעֲשִׂי) portrays her at the close of the unit as a totally corrupted character. The drive for her lewd pursuits has become so deeply ingrained that all her words and all her actions only emit her evil disposition. The legal *non sequitur* and the graphic descriptions in 3.1-3 laid the foundation for this portrayal. Yet, YHWH’s final verdict rests ultimately on her undeniable and self-incriminating words.

Directly related to this portrayal, the third component of YHWH’s response (וַתִּזְכָּל) forms a highly suitable conclusion to the unit’s rhetoric of disproportion and its depiction of Jerusalem’s lawless and limitless conduct. Evidently, the utterly inappropriate address of YHWH as parent and partner has eradicated all hope for change that the frame of 3.1-3 and 3.4a may have created. Far beyond mere disappointment, however, the phrasing of Jerusalem’s words has revealed just how far she would go to save herself. As her obscene schemes do not stop even before YHWH, the speech quotation in 3.1-5 provides a grotesque confirmation of YHWH’s verdict, especially with regard to its final

---

58. Cf. Brueggemann, “Israel’s Sense of Place,” in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (PTMS 1; eds. J. J. Jackson and Kessler; Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick, 1974), p. 155.

word: Jerusalem has not only failed YHWH's expectations, but she has committed unspeakable evil to herself, to her environment, and to YHWH, beyond what anyone could have imagined.

The vindication of YHWH and the justification of his judgment that was articulated in 3.1 is thus set on an even stronger foundation through the framed quotation. Since the evil of her deeds and words has crossed all conceivable boundaries, Jerusalem is fully deserving of the wrath of which she is so afraid. While several interpreters have drawn attention to the climactic function of YHWH's response, it is not self-evident that 3.5b expresses final rejection, or even that it poses a declaration of judgment.<sup>59</sup> There is strong indictment in 3.1b-3, yet the only explicit notion of judgment in the unit is part of Jerusalem's private speech in 3.5a which, ironically, focuses on YHWH's forgiving character. Even if the הנה-phrase in 3.5b recalls the announcement in 2.35b (הִנְנִי וְשֹׁפֵט), the final line of the unit does not present Jerusalem's words as grounds for coming punishment. Rather, the reference to her speech, actions, and excess is primarily descriptive, drawing together in the most compressed form the central dimensions of her character.

This profile stands in striking juxtaposition to YHWH's actions and words, especially to his hopes embedded in the reformulated וְשׁוֹב-phrase in 3.1 ("Can he again return to her?"), his suspended prerogative to execute her, his continued, communicative engagement, and his efforts to open her eyes to her self-destruction. While there may be a hint of acceptance in the summative

---

59. So, e.g., Giesebrecht: "Schroffe Abweisung Judas"; p. 15; Herrmann: "Eine hart formulierte Auseinandersetzung"; p. 213; Long, "Components": "V. 2-5, which develop invective and accusation, ending with a final, abrupt charge, full of sarcasm and disgust"; p. 386; While Lundbom initially describes 3.1-5 as "a poem of uncompromising judgment," he observes later that "the judgment is never explicitly given"; *Rhetoric*, pp. 37-39.

outline of 3.5b,<sup>60</sup> this disproportion between YHWH's beyond-the-norm endeavours and Jerusalem's beyond-the-norm excesses colours his last words in tones of disappointment, resignation, and lament. All of YHWH's exposing questions and critique were meant to display before Jerusalem the detriment caused by her affairs. Yet, the very moment when she finally turns to him and responds reveals the extent of her corruption, deception, and self-serving motives more blatantly than ever before.

#### 4. Conclusion

Contrasting the previous quotations in 2.1-3.5, the quotation in 3.1-5 was distinguished by an extended anterior frame, consisting of the legal adaptation and exposition in 3.1-3 and the immediately preceding material in 3.4a. The inset was not included within the keywords chains (cf. חֲנֹךְ, רַע, זִנָּה) that connect the unit; nonetheless, its contextual integration was apparent in the repeated, double-interrogative structures in 3.1a and 3.4-5a, the placement of the inset across two adjacent verses, and the bracket of one preceding and one postpositive *verbum dicendi* (קִרְאתִי/דִבַּרְתִּי). As in all of the previous quotations, Jerusalem's words in 3.4-5a are inseparably embedded within their literary environment and cannot be analyzed in isolation.

In view of the elaborate address in 3.1-3, the present unit has provided a particularly strong demonstration of the interference and perspectival control of the frame. Endowed with the legal anchorage of the adapted law of Deut 24.1-4, YHWH is established from the first verse as an authoritative speaker. This is rekindled by the repeated interrogative structure in which the quotation is placed and also underlies the closing verdict in 3.5b. The frame of YHWH's authority places his exposition of Jerusalem's excessive, vulgar, and corrupted

---

60. Cf. Fischer: "Faktisches Anerkennen"; p. 187.

behaviour on a sure foundation. Ultimately, it is this character profile which sets the tone for the quotation and reveals the unspeakable perversion that it articulates. Framed by the explicit portrayal of 3.1-3, her words take the description of her corruption to the next level, depicting her as so utterly twisted that even YHWH himself is not exempt from her vile manoeuvres.

That previous readings of the quotation in 3.4-5a have not discerned these dynamics is due to some extent to the preconceived notion of a marriage metaphor which is said to dominate the unit. As our analysis has demonstrated, this interpretation is founded on the misapprehension of the rhetoric in 3.1-3 and the appellations in 3.4. The primary reason for this lack of attention, however, may be found in the disconnect between the quotation and the framing impact of the discourse that precedes it. Only if the initial characterization of Jerusalem as transcending all normative frameworks is brought to bear upon her attributed speech, and only if YHWH's descriptions of her atrocities are combined with her demonstrative and despicable address, can the full contribution of the quotation come to light. The interrelationship between frame and inset in 3.1-5 demonstrates in the most graphic terms the portrayal of Jerusalem that is articulated in YHWH's final verdict in 3.5b: the city is utterly corrupt, all her words and all her actions are evil and excessive. The depth of her perversion is, in fact, of such magnitude that descriptions of it cannot be placed on YHWH's lips.

As the counterpart to this characterization of Jerusalem, the speech quotation also vindicates YHWH. Her words in 3.4-5 affirm the accuracy of his assessment in 3.1-3 beyond what anyone could have imagined. However, despite this explicit demonstration of her corruption, YHWH's forgiving disposition is elevated in lieu of a thundering declaration of judgment. As a noteworthy



parallel to the historical recital of YHWH's redemption and protection in the first quotation in 2.1-3.5 (cf. 2.6), the last inset in the discourse likewise paints a positive picture of his character. The interplay of frame and quotation in 3.1-5 would fully justify YHWH's judgment of the twisted city, yet his response in the final line of the unit shows no change to his forbearing disposition.

The discourse of 2.1-3.5 ends with this elevation of YHWH's character and the exposure of Jerusalem's perversion. The divine address shifts in 3.6 from the city and the people to the prophet; the composition's direct charges, colourful metaphors, and vivid quotations give way to divine introspection (v. 7); the historical horizon of the whole nation is recast into a comparison between the northern and the southern kingdoms (vv. 8-11). The book's first depiction of Judah and Jerusalem is completed and yet there has been no resolution or conclusion. YHWH's address to people and city ends on a note of lament (2.32; 3.5b) and the way forward is not explicitly mapped out. Well-suited to its tumultuous shifts of speech, images, and topics, 2.1-3.5 is open-ended, leaving the reader with more questions than answers. The ways in which this discourse serves as an introduction to the book and how its quotations contribute to this function will be addressed in the following chapter.

## **Chapter Nine - Reading Prophetic Speech Quotations: Jeremiah 2.1-3.5 and Beyond**

### **1. Introduction**

Based on the analysis of 2.1-3.5 in the previous five chapters, we will now present a unified portrayal of the passage and its quotations and discuss how they contribute to the book's first address to Judah and Jerusalem. Beyond 2.1-3.5, the overview and comparison advanced in our introduction invites us to consider three further questions: 1) How do the twelve insets in this passage and our observations about them relate to other quotations in Jeremiah? 2) What contribution does the distinctive feature of repeated and attributed speech make to the book? 3) Are the insights of our study applicable to quotations in other prophetic texts? While the answers to these questions serve to summarize our analytical work on 2.1-3.5, our discussion is designed throughout to indicate potential research trajectories for the interpretation and reading of prophetic speech quotations.

### **2. The Discourse and Quotations of Jeremiah 2.1-3.5**

In keeping with our central argument, the contribution of the twelve quotations in 2.1-3.5 can only be understood in light of the arrangement and purpose of their framing discourse. Our initial reluctance towards root metaphors and other large-scale schemata has been validated through careful reading of the passage. The indicators for an overarching marital theme are sparse and better understood as a rhetorical foil to expose Jerusalem's excess and illicit allegiances (cf. 2.1-3, 20, 33; 3.1). Form-critical strictures are eclipsed (2.4-13), cultic speculations give way to metaphorical denunciations (2.20, 23-25; 3.2-3), and neither the imagery of water nor that of ways, plants, or wilderness can assert control over the varied and quick-paced contours of the composition. At its core,

2.1-3.5 sternly resists reading strategies that stifle the nuances of its vast rhetorical array.

The configuration of 2.1-3.5 likewise thwarts the quest for its historical frame of reference. Its accusations against leaders, idol worship, and murdered prophets remain generic, the references to sin and salvation in the past are not specified, and even the explicit mention of Egypt and Assyria is included only for the sake of YHWH's comparative rhetoric. The passage is marked throughout by a lack of historical specificity, refusing to have its message and rhetorical mechanisms constrained to one particular setting. Combined with its aversion to systematization, this kind of discourse is an appropriate opening of Jeremiah's first twenty chapters which contain virtually no historical markers across their tumultuous literary landscape.

These characteristics indicate that the primary purpose of 2.1-3.5 must not be sought in relation to a specific overarching principle or historical setting but with regard to its place in the book. Whereas Jer 1 offers the first encounter with YHWH and the prophet and announces the basic plot of the following fifty-one chapters, the discourse of 2.1-3.5 introduces the book's addressees, Jerusalem and Judah, from a specific vantage point. Both the city and the people are rebuked in the passage for repeating the mistakes of the past. Direct appeals and indirect images expose the absurdity that marks this behaviour. The numerous questions seek to open the eyes of YHWH's addressees who exchange him, their fountain of life, their liberator and leader, for the precarious promises of useless idols and harmful nations. By virtue of these rhetorical means, 2.1-3.5 introduces Judah and Jerusalem as unresponsive to YHWH's warnings and exposition, as dismissive of the negative example of his historical analogies, and as excessive and inexplicable in their withdrawal from him.

Our analysis has demonstrated the integral and subservient role of the twelve speech quotations throughout this passage and there are several ways in

which they uniquely contribute to its introductory purpose. Before we address some of these, however, it is important to affirm that the quotations do not play a significant role in the *organization* of 2.1-3.5. As an integral element among the various images, imperatives, charges, and comparisons, they do not provide structure but participate in their own capacity to the multifarious nature of the discourse. The inclusion of the twelve insets does not foster the text's formal coherence but increases its fragmentation and disorder. Thrown into its expansive mix of entwined and repeated components, the diverse array of these quotations boosts the literary chaos of the passage.

Similar to how each constituent of 2.1-3.5 plays its own part in this tumultuous discourse, the twelve insets make a number of distinctive contributions. For instance, they infuse into YHWH's long address the element of communicative variation. Under the guise of indirection and attribution, the quoted words of the people and the city create breaks in the divine discourse which diversify the voice of the text and rekindle interest and concentration on the part of its audience. The deliberate insertion of the utterances of other speakers alongside YHWH suffuses a homogeneous address with liveliness, allows for scenes of verbal interaction and debate, and interjects alternative perspectives and opinions. By means of the interplay of frames and insets in 2.1-3.5, the discourse dynamics are not dominated by YHWH's voice but instead depict him in constant communication with his people and his city.

In this unique capacity, the speech quotations fulfill the function of accentuating and affirming YHWH's words. Whether in the portrayal of Judah's failure to speak and know (2.8), the arrangement of insets around central assertions (2.23-25, 27, 35), or the vulgar record in 3.1-3 and Jerusalem's audacious words in 3.4-5a, the quotations demonstrate the accuracy of YHWH's

descriptions in a way that no other literary element can. The purposeful combination of referential speaking and verbal showing plays a special role in the comparative rhetoric of the passage and in its critique of absurd behaviour and choices. Neither Judah's failure to confess the most fundamental aspects of YHWH's character nor Jerusalem's self-absorption and contradictions can be depicted in a more credible, colourful, and compelling manner than in the form of attributed, direct speech. Subsumed under YHWH's voice and vantage point, the quoted words of Judah and Jerusalem substantiate his words, place convicting voices from past and present alongside his own, and comprise an indisputable witness to the actions and attitudes of his addressees.

These communicative and demonstrative capacities of the quotations enhance the characterization of the city and the people. They create a portrayal that is revelatory and self-incriminating, expressing, for instance, fateful negligence, ungratefulness, explosive resistance, self-delusion, and perversion. Beyond these vivid depictions, the quotations manifest the deep dimensions which underlie Judah's inexplicable withdrawal and Jerusalem's unfounded refusal. The inset dynamics in 2.4-9 relate the people's absurd preference for unreliable idols to their failure to know YHWH as redeemer. Likewise, the mix of communication structures, comparisons, and quotations in 2.26-32 identifies Judah's neglect of knowing YHWH as father and lord as the primary cause for their pursuit of powerless gods. Jerusalem's quotations provide the subtext for her indiscriminate pursuits and destructive allegiances (2.24, 33, 36; 3.2) and base her denial of YHWH and the magnitude of her excesses (2.35; 3.4-5a) in her self-centred disposition.

The phenomenon of quoted speech thus adds a distinctive expository dimension to the discourse, laying bare what lies underneath, explaining what appears inexplicable, revealing inward attitudes, and disclosing the cause for calamity. The twelve insets demonstrate that the absurd and atrocious

behaviour that 2.1-3.5 confronts is, at its root, the consequence of not knowing YHWH. His acts of redemption have vanished from the people's confessions and his rightful attributes and acclaim are assigned to self-made gods. He has liberated Jerusalem and has given her life, yet she devotes herself to everyone but him. It is for this reason that his historical object lessons are ignored and that his confrontation and correction bear no fruit. The city revolves only around herself and the people rise up against their life-giving God whom they regard as a source of death and darkness.

To sum up, the speech quotations in 2.1-3.5 transform YHWH's extensive address into a communicatively diverse scenario, demonstrate the accuracy of his charges in emphatic detail, shape the character profiles of the speakers involved, and expose the root problem that underlies the various outward appearances and actions. Inseparably integrated into YHWH's address and fully subservient to its communicative goals, these contributions support the introductory function that 2.1-3.5 exerts in the book. The quotations present the city and the people as irrevocably beyond YHWH's calls for reformation and in this way lay an important foundation for the dynamics of tearing down and rebuilding that are announced in Jer 1.

By articulating this justification for the divine judgment and the need for a thorough renewal, the quotations vindicate YHWH. This purpose has emerged in every frame-inset scenario in 2.1-3.5. Its strongest manifestation, however, occurs in the positive portrayal of the opening *irrealis* inset (2.6) and the affirmation of his forgiveness in the final quote (3.5a). Enclosing the discourse as a whole, the people's failure to know and speak and the city's self-serving words are employed to uphold YHWH's redemption and forbearance. These two quotations foreshadow the dynamics that surface especially in the

restoration promises in Jer 30-31. It is precisely in the midst of Judah's absurd withdrawal and in the face of Jerusalem's self-absorbed tactics that the Book of Jeremiah most explicitly reveals the character of YHWH, Israel's God, who against all odds plants anew and rebuilds from the ashes.

### **3. Quoted Speech in the Book of Jeremiah**

We began this study by highlighting the pervasive and diverse character of quoted speech in the prophetic corpus. While identifying 2.1-3.5 as a suitable case study because of the number and density of its quotations, we observed in a brief comparison with Isaiah and Ezekiel that the phenomenon is a dominant feature of Jeremiah as a whole. The book outnumbers its counterparts especially in the opening chapters: in Jer 1-6, we find twenty-eight insets; Isa 1-10 contains nine quotations and Ezek 1-10 records only six instances. Prompted by this distribution, we will now consider how the insets in 2.1-3.5 and our observations concerning them relate to the quotations in Jer 1-6 and other instances in the book. With the disproportionately frequent use of quotation (ca. 130 instances) and this curious accumulation in its early chapters, it remains to be determined what wider contribution this distinctive literary feature makes to Jeremiah's arrangement and message.

Selecting 2.1-3.5 as the text for our case study, we anticipated the question of whether or not it contains representative value for other prophetic quotations. While its accumulation and density of quoted utterances ascribe to this passage a special place within the prophetic corpus, a number of indicators allow us to extrapolate our observations legitimately to other quotations. For instance, many of Jeremiah's quoted phrases share the marks of integration that we detected in 2.1-3.5. In addition to the frequent keyword connections

between frames and insets,<sup>1</sup> a range of quotations play a part in interrogative structures (cf. 2.5-6, 27-28; 3.4-5) and several instances are joined to other quotations.<sup>2</sup> The intrinsic union between quotation and context also manifests itself in the notable locations in which insets occur throughout the book. In 4.31, for example, Jerusalem's lament closes a chapter replete with judgment scenes and connects it to the question of divine forgiveness in 5.1-9. In 18.12, Judah's defiance is quoted in response to YHWH's discourse of pottery and potential pardon. In 32.25, the extensive prayer of the prophet culminates by quoting YHWH's startling command to purchase a field in the face of the imminent Babylonian conquest. The need for interpreting inset and frame together is thus reinforced by other quotations within Jeremiah.

Beyond this basic aspect of integration, the communicative diversification that we discerned in our case study is evident especially in the quotations in Jer 1-6. YHWH's first speech in the book (1.5-10) is interrupted after only one verse by a self-quotation of the prophet which in turn is quoted and refuted by the divine command. This vividness of divergent perspectives continues in 3.6-6.30. YHWH quotes his inner thoughts (3.7, 19) and again is interrupted by Jeremiah who quotes and questions him (4.10). A declaration of impending doom is quoted (4.11) and the chaotic blend of interjections and images culminates in 4.31 in a quoted "Woe is me!" attributed to Jerusalem. In Jer 5, the people and the prophet are correlated via quoted affronts and announcements (vv. 1-5, 12, 19, 24) and Jer 6 connects quotations from self-

---

1. See, e.g., Jer 1.6-7 (נָעַר אֶנְכִּי); Jer 2.27-28 (קוֹם/יִשַׁע); Jer 3.7 (שׁוּב); Jer 4.10-19 (נָגַע + עַד); Jer 6.14/8.11 (שְׁלוֹם); Jer 6.16-17 (הִלֵּךְ/קִשַׁב); Jer 13.12 (מֵלֵא + יֵין); Jer 22.21 (שָׁמַע); Jer 27.9-11 (עֲבַד); Jer 31.29-30 (quoted proverb); Jer 35.6 (שָׁתָה + יֵין); Jer 37.9 (הִלֵּךְ); Jer 46.8-9 (עֲלָה).

2. For bonds of quotations and questions, see, e.g., 8.19; 22.14-15; 26.9; 33.24; 46.7-8; 49.4. For two or more insets within the same unit or clause, see, e.g., 5.12-19; 6.16-21; 11.18-23; 14.13-16; 20.7-12; 22.13-19; 23.17, 33-38; 27.8-15; 32.1-8, 36-44; 42.13-14; 48.1-6.



assured leaders (v. 14) and the resistant populace in general (vv. 16-17).

Combined with the communicative variations in 2.1-3.5, the quotations in the first six chapters of the book create discourse dynamics that are fast-paced, multifaceted, and lively. YHWH is depicted throughout interacting with a variety of speakers whom he quotes and who quote him. Similar to the communication structures in 2.4-9 and 2.26-32, other passages in Jer 1-6 place quoted words at the intersection of address and reference. In 5.12-14, the inset is assigned to the people from a third person perspective (וַיֹּאמְרוּ), yet YHWH then speaks in the same breath *to them* (יַעַן דְּבַרְכֶּם) and tells his prophet (בְּפִיךָ) *about them* (וְאֶכְלָתֶם). Although Judah is initially addressed in 6.16-21 (עַמּוֹדֵי/וֹרְאוֹ), the quotations are phrased in referential terms (וַיֹּאמְרוּ) and employed in YHWH's speech to the nations (שְׁמַעוּ הַגּוֹיִם) and the cosmos (שְׁמַעֵי הָאָרֶץ).<sup>3</sup> As in 2.1-3.5, quotations are employed in Jeremiah's complex discourse patterns to correlate and juxtapose different speakers and listeners. These dynamics and the multiple insertions and interruptions that they create in Jer 1-6 yield a conversation scenario in which every word can be contested, every opinion can be questioned, and all discourse participants are summoned to pay attention and judge one another.<sup>4</sup> A central part of the turbulent opening chapters, the quotations draw the reader into the interaction between the various speakers and conflicting positions present throughout the remainder of the book.

This process of involvement is not arbitrary but controlled by the forces

---

3. As another communicatively complex scenario, we may add those cases in which the same inset is placed on the lips of different speakers. For instance, both YHWH and Jeremiah attribute in 14.13-16 a similar pronouncement to the "false" prophets. In Jer 27, the identical saying is quoted from the lips of foreign prophets (v. 9) and Judah's prophets (v. 14). Particularly intriguing is the threefold appearance of the same quoted phrase (נָתַן + בִּיד) across Jeremiah's prayer (32.25) and YHWH's response (32.36, 43).

4. Among the researchers of Jeremiah's polyphonic arrangement, this observation is shared especially by Glanz's study of the book's referential shifts: "In many sections of Jeremiah the text creates the impression that when YHWH or the prophet is speaking a whole parliament of dialogue partners with many different parties is present"; *Shifts*, p. 346.

of integration, attribution, and contextual interference. Each quotation in this polyphonic layout is a subservient element in its respective frame of YHWH's speech and is employed to elevate his character, accentuate his descriptions, and promote his evaluation of the conversation and its participants. Extending our observations from 2.1-3.5, the quotations in Jer 1-6 serve in this capacity to justify YHWH's judgment and to vindicate him. As the Book of Jeremiah opens its prolonged explanation of the collapse of Judah and Jerusalem, the attribution of words and the attribution of responsibility go hand in hand.

However, the use of quoted speech in these opening chapters goes beyond theodicy. Amid the literary tumult of insertion and invasion, the particular phrasing and framing of the insets depicts YHWH as approachable and communicative. Across his participation in the polyphony of Jer 1-6, this becomes apparent especially in the daring quotation of his words by Jeremiah (4.10), the public presentation of his inward hopes (3.7, 19), and the *irrealis* inset in 5.24 which elevates him as a reliable provider. What the positive portrayal in 2.6 and the indirect assurance of his forbearance in 3.5 articulate is confirmed by other quoted words in Jer 1-6. At the outset of a book that grapples with the causes and culprits of the exile, these quoted declarations establish the hope that YHWH's righteous declaration of judgment has not been his final word.

These observations lead us directly to the distinctive contribution that the quotations make to the book's arrangement and message. In marked contrast to the YHWH-centred opening of Ezekiel, the catena of doom and restoration oracles in Isa 1-5, and Hosea's symbolic marriage that launches the Book of the Twelve, Jeremiah is given an altogether different character by its frequent use of quoted speech. The frequent appearance of the phenomenon in

the introductory chapters creates a portrayal of YHWH that significantly differs from Ezekiel's overwhelming vision of his glory and Isaiah's scenes of his royal mountain. Instead, the opening chapters of Jeremiah picture Israel's God in the midst of his people, speaking and being addressed, quoting and being quoted, challenging and being questioned. Alongside the sovereign portrayal of YHWH in the call of the prophet, the pervasive use of quotations in Jer 1-6 shows him right there amidst the chaos and looming catastrophe, communicating with Judah, who refuses to listen and learn, pursuing Jerusalem, who speaks only on her own terms, and leading Jeremiah, who is confounded by his mission.

Since this depiction of YHWH's verbal pursuit and presence continues throughout the remainder of Jeremiah,<sup>5</sup> the quotations in the opening chapters increase the unity of the book. This contribution also comes to light through their connections to the insets in subsequent chapters. For instance, the arrogant denial of Jerusalem in 22.21 (אַמְרַתָּ לֹא אֶשְׁמָע) recalls the staccato phrases and firm rejection of YHWH that we saw in the insets in 2.20-25. Likewise, Judah's scoffing dismissal of YHWH's word that is quoted in 17.15 (אֵינִי) echoes the missing reverence that was displayed by the *irrealis* quotations in 2.4-9.<sup>6</sup> These parallels show that the phenomenon of repeated and attributed speech is employed throughout Jeremiah to point back and reactivate character profiles and charges that were established in the introductory chapters. Whether in the form of a quotation commentary or as studies on

---

5. This is indicated, for instance, by YHWH's *persistent* address to his wayward people (הַשְׁכֵּם; cf. 7.13, 25; 11.7; 25.3-4; 26.5; 29.19; 32.33; 35.15; 44.4), the promise not to make a "full end" (לֹא + כִּלְהָ; cf. 4.27; 5.10, 18; 30.11/46.28), the reassurance of the prophet (15.19-21; cf. 1.17-19), the comforting address to the Judahites even after their deportation (29.1-14), and the divine commitment articulated in Jer 30-33 (e.g., 31.20, 28, 36; 32.42-44; 33.19-26).

6. See further, e.g., 2.20/27.9, 14 (לֹא + עֲבַד); Jer 2.25b/18.12 (נֹאֵשׁ + אַחֵר + הִלֵּךְ); Jer 2.27-28/46.16 (קִוְיָה + יֵלֵךְ). We may further add the *irrealis* quotations in 2.4-9, 5.24, 8.6, and 43.2. Overholt extended his observations about the quotes' authenticity in a similar way to the entire book: "All of this suggests that we are here dealing with an element of the prophet's personal style and that the observations made above will have implications for the study of the remainder of the book"; "Problem," p. 272.

individual passages, these and other connections present a fascinating avenue of research for how quoted speech contributes to the unity and message of Jeremiah.

We close our discussion of Jeremiah by highlighting one final example of how the quotations in 2.1-3.5 prepare subsequent quotation passages. The frame-inset scenario in 16.19-21 is intriguing not only because it concludes the chapter's account of expulsion (vv. 10-13, 16-18) and regathering (vv. 14-15), but also because it brings us back to the first two quotations of our study:

16.19	יְהוָה עֻזִּי וּמְצֻלִי וּמְנוּסֵי בְיוֹם צָרָה אֵלֶיךָ גּוֹיִם יָבֹאוּ מֵאַפְסֵי-אָרֶץ וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֲדֹ-שָׁקֶר נָחֲלוּ אֲבוֹתֵינוּ הַבֵּל וְאִין-בָּם מוֹעִיל	O YHWH, my strength and my stronghold, my refuge in the day of disaster! To you the nations will come from the ends of the earth and they will say: "Surely our fathers have inherited delusion, deceptive idols which do not benefit."
16.20	הֲיַעֲשֶׂה-לּוֹ אָדָם אֱלֹהִים וְהֵמָּה לֹא אֱלֹהִים	Can man make for himself gods? And those are not gods!
16.21	לָכֵן הֲנִי מוֹדִיעֵם בַּפֶּעַם הַזֹּאת אֹדִיעֵם אֶת-יָדִי וְאֶת-גְּבוּרָתִי וַיֵּדְעוּ כִּי-שְׁמִי יְהוָה	Therefore, I am about to make them know, at this time, I will make them know my power and might and they will know that my name is YHWH.

These final verses of Jer 16 are replete with lexical links to 2.4-13: in 16.19b alone, the lexemes *הבל*, *אבות* (cf. 2.5), *גוי* (cf. 2.7), *נחל* and *יעל* (cf. 2.11) reappear. The exclamation in 16.20 records an identical version of the phrase *וְהֵמָּה לֹא אֱלֹהִים* which featured so prominently in the assertion of YHWH's incomparability in 2.11. Moreover, both passages utilize quoted speech (2.6, 8; 16.19b) and feature the verb *ידע* in 2.8 and 16.21. As in 2.4-13, 26-32, and the examples cited from other passages in Jeremiah, the quotation is framed amid complex discourse dynamics, including the words of the prophet (16.19), the

statement in 16.20—spoken by Jeremiah, YHWH, or a generic speaker?—and YHWH’s final announcement (16.21).

While these links establish the correspondence between 2.4-13 and 16.19-21, we note a number of intriguing differences in their application. The quoted words in Jer 16 are not attributed to Israel but to the nations who are thereby depicted as avoiding Israel’s failure that the *irrealis* inset in 2.6 had denounced. Likewise, the international scope of YHWH’s address in 2.10-13 exposed the absurd behaviour of his people, yet in 16.19, a multitude of nations (מֵאַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ) is presented as counteracting Israel’s example: whereas in 2.4-9 the people followed the path of their misled ancestors (אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם, v. 5), the nations in Jer 16 see through their fathers’ deceit (שֶׁקֶר נִחַלּוּ אֲבוֹתֵינוּ). This quoted admission testifies precisely to the central fact that Israel failed to recognize in 2.10-13: all gods beside YHWH are man-made products and thus not gods at all (וְהָמָּה לֹא אֱלֹהִים).

Similar to other passages in Jeremiah,<sup>7</sup> these modifications evidently denigrate Israel’s elevated role among the nations. The use of quoted speech in 2.4-13 and 16.19-21 is one of many avenues by which the book depicts YHWH’s word and work as extending beyond political and geographical boundaries. In its immediate context, the adapted framing and phrasing of the quotation also serves as a setup for YHWH’s statement in 16.21. In addition to affirming the preceding denouncement of the incapable idols, this final verse supplies the answer to Judah’s root problem as exposed by the quotations in 2.4-13. Before all nations and his own people, the failure to know YHWH as the only reliable

---

7. We may turn in this regard, for instance, to the prophet’s international mandate (נְבִיא לְגוֹיִם, Jer 1.5), the notable inclusion of Judah amidst Egypt, Edom, and Ammon in the list in 9.25 (MT), the integration of Israel’s neighbours in the midst of YHWH’s people (בְּתוֹךְ עַמִּי, Jer 12.16), the equal standing of the nations and Israel in regard to YHWH’s economy of judgment (18.1-11), the place of Judah and Jerusalem within YHWH’s universal judgment (25.17-26), and the restoration promises for Moab (48.47), Ammon (49.6), and Elam (49.39) which all use the same terms as those of Judah (שׁוּב שְׁבוּת; cf. 29.14; 30.3, 18; 31.23; 32.44; 33.7, 11, 26).

redeemer will be resolved through his own initiative (יָדַע 3× in 16.21).<sup>8</sup> He himself will make known his power and might in such a way that everyone will know who he is.

#### 4. Quoted Speech in the Prophets

Having demonstrated the applicability of our case study with respect to the rest of Jeremiah's quotations, it remains to consider the same question for other prophetic books. The proportion of quoted words in Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve is considerably lower than in Jeremiah, yet many of them exhibit the same characteristics as those instances that we discussed in our analysis. In order to establish a basis for extrapolating from our case study to the prophets more widely, we will now briefly discuss three such characteristics in the hope of inspiring further research into prophetic speech quotations.

We begin as previously with the question of integration. While it is impossible to go into too much detail, we note that some quotations blend with rhetorical or thematic sequences similar to those in 2.4-9 or 2.31. The inset in Isa 5.19, for instance, stands amidst a series of "woe-sayings" (vv. 8-24), that of Joel 4.10 (MT) echoes the military lexemes of its frame, and the quote in Hab 2.19 is fused thematically with the idol polemics that surround it. Other insets are linked to their environment through keywords (cf. Jer 2.35: נָקָה/נָקִי), through modified *verba dicendi* (cf. Jer 2.23: אָיֶךְ), or through their correlation to

---

8. The verb יָדַע appears forty times in Jer 1-16. Following in the vein of 2.8 (לֹא אָמְרוּ/לֹא יָדָעוּ), it is used throughout these chapters only in negation when ascribed to YHWH's people (4.22; 5.4; 6.15; 8.7, 12; 9.3, 6; 14.18). Along the positive trajectory of the appeal in 9.23 (הַמִּתְהַלֵּל) (הַשֹּׁכֵל יָדַע אוֹתִי) and the model confession in 14.20 (יָדַעְנוּ יְהוָה רָשָׁעֵנוּ), the threefold use of יָדַע in 16.21, which is unique in Jeremiah, constitutes a powerful antidote to this pervasive failure to know YHWH and his ways. The theme of "knowing YHWH" culminates in the promise of restoration in 31.34: "And they will no longer teach each one his friend and each one his brother, saying: 'Know YHWH!' For they will all know me" (כִּי-כֻלָּם יָדָעוּ אוֹתִי).

questions or other insets.<sup>9</sup> These marks of integration testify to the inseparable fusion of inset and frame and the need to interpret these quotations in the sway of their literary, structural, and rhetorical relations.

Similar to some of the passages in our case study (cf. 2.25, 31; 3.4-5a), the significance of the placement of the quotations can also be discerned in other books, especially with regard to final discourse positions. For instance, a quoted question concerning the nations' uncertain escape from judgment closes the unit of Isa 20.1-6. In Joel 2.17, a priestly lament culminates by quoting a taunt by the nations (אֵיזָה אֶל־הָיָהִים) which then brings about YHWH's intervention (vv. 18-27). In Amos 9.10, Israel's self-security is quoted prior to the restoration prophecy which concludes the book (vv. 11-15). These are only a few impressions of the various roles that insets can play in such locations,<sup>10</sup> yet they illustrate that the question of placement bears considerable exegetical significance and promises new insights into the role of the phenomenon within prophetic literature.

The polyphonic dynamics of Jeremiah's quotations also appear in a number of other prophetic texts. The quarrel between potter and clay in Isa 45.9-10, for instance, incorporates three individual insets to depict the frenzy of the verbal exchange. In Zech 1.1-6, YHWH correlates the words of his prophets and Israel's penitent ancestors in order to demonstrate the efficacy of his word. Such instances, however, are usually scattered throughout the individual books

---

9. See, e.g., Isa 14.11-12 (שָׁמַיִם); Isa 19.11 (חֹכֶם); Ezek 16.44-45 (אִם/בֵּית); Ezek 36.35 (שָׁמַיִם/הָרִס); Joel 4.9-10 (גִּבּוֹר). More examples are listed in Wolff, "Zitat," pp. 91-92. In addition to the modified *verba dicendi* in Jeremiah (cf. "Context and Identification" in chapter two above), there are other instances in which the verb of speaking is linked with כִּי (Isa 8.19; 10.8; 23.4; 28.15; Ezek 8.12; 9.9; Hos 10.3), with יַעַן (Ezek 25.3, 8; 29.9; 35.10; 36.2; 36.13), with לִכֵּן (Isa 28.15; Mic 3.11), or with other framing particles and prepositions; see, e.g., מֵעַל (Mal 2.14); בּוֹ + לֵב (Isa 14.13, 16; Zeph 1.12; 2.15). For links between quotations and questions, see, e.g., Isa 40.27; Ezek 12.22; 18.2; 28.9; Hos 13.10; Joel 2.17; Mic 2.6-7; Hab 2.19.

10. See further, e.g., Isa 33.24; 42.17; 44.16-17, 26-28; 48.5; 51.16, 23; 56.12; Ezek 11.3; 18.29; 20.32; 28.9; Hos 2.25 (MT); Amos 8.14; Zeph 2.15. For quotations at the opening of a unit (cf. 2.20), see, e.g., Isa 40.27; Ezek 18.19; 28.2; 33.10, 30; Hos 8.2.

and nowhere comprise such dense communication scenarios as in Jer 1-6.<sup>11</sup> The inclusion of quotations within structures of address and reference, such as those in 2.4-9, 26-32, 5.12-14, and 6.16-21, likewise are sparse and do not attain to the complexity of Jeremiah's discourse.<sup>12</sup> While intricacies of this kind remain a distinctive feature of the book, our study can aid the recognition and interpretation of quoted utterances within their communicative frames of reference.

This brief overview shows that the insets in Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve exhibit the same means of integration and prompt the same questions of the quotes' placement and communicative contribution as the instances in Jeremiah. These shared characteristics suggest that the observations of our case study are relevant to the prophetic corpus *en large*. Beyond noting these parallels and offering a few examples and references, we are, however, in no position to draw any further conclusions. How these quotations relate to their frames, what exactly they contribute in their particular locations, and how they combine with or contrast with the words spoken and quoted around them cannot be captured in any form of summary or synthesis. As demonstrated in our review, method, and analysis, every frame-inset relationship is a unique incident and requires its own treatment. Applying the analytical procedure that was modeled in our study, any exploration of the intriguing dynamics of repeated and attributed speech will have much to offer to

---

11. For two or more quoted insets within the same verse or unit, see, e.g., Isa 14.4-20; 30.16; 36.7, 13-20; 44.5, 16-17; 47.5-11; 49.3-4, 9; Ezek 13.10-12; 33.17-20; 36.2; 38.10-13; Hos 2.6-10 (MT); 10.8; Joel 2.17; Amos 6.9-10; 8.1-6; Mic 2.3-7; Hab 2.19; Zech 1.4-6; 8.20-23; 13.2-9; Mal 1; 2.17; 3.6-15. For the repetition of an inset within the same unit, see, e.g., Isa 36.15, 18; Ezek 13.6-7.

12. To give an example, in Isa 14.12-20 YHWH quotes the self-exaltation of the Babylonian king and juxtaposes it with a referential quote of those who observe his fall (see, e.g., also Isa 21.4-10).



a better understanding of prophetic discourse.

## Conclusion

The interpretation of prophetic speech quotations ought to centre neither on the misplaced question of authenticity nor be structured around isolated utterances and fixed categories. Instead, it must concern itself primarily with the interplay between quoted inset and framing context. This argument initially arose from our assessment of previous studies and, above all, from our interaction with the work of Wolff and Overholt (chapter 1). Our discussion of the methodological parameters that Sternberg and others have provided served to consolidate the argument and to spell out its implications for the interpretation, function, communication, and identification of quoted speech (chapter 2). Having discussed the text and structure of 2.1-3.5 (chapter 3), the main portion of our study applied the insights from these foundations of scholarship and method to the twelve quotations in this passage (chapters 4-8). A separate chapter was devoted to the summary of this analysis and its implications for the remaining quotations in Jeremiah and other prophetic books (chapter 9).

Along this course of appraisal, argument, and analysis, our study has produced a number of exegetical insights. Close engagement with the discourse of 2.1-3.5 has challenged monochrome reading strategies and historical speculations alike. As a result of their particular interpretive foci, none of the recent studies related to this text, such as those by Liwak (1987), Biddle (1990), or Wischnowsky (2001), have given as much attention to its literary and rhetorical shape as our analysis of its quotations. Of particular significance are in this regard the role of Jerusalem as YHWH's feminine addressee, the meaningful interplay of address and reference, the rhetoric of comparison, and the communicative and lamenting portrayal of YHWH. These outcomes serve to

show that any cogent analysis of speech quotations will always contribute to the comprehension of the text, structure, and discourse within which they occur. This is to be expected of every interpretation of quoted speech that seriously considers its dualistic and integrated nature: in studying the part, one will always learn more about the whole.

For this reason, all of our observations about 2.1-3.5 are rooted in the central contention that prophetic speech quotations must be interpreted within their literary context. Confronting the operations of extraction and categorization that we have detected across many previous studies, our combined account of method and analysis has brought to light a number of parameters which are crucial for an adequate interpretation of the phenomenon. We will here briefly review the five most significant items.

First, our analysis has confirmed and exceeded Overholt's observations about the integration of the quotations. While his work addressed this essential dimension only with respect to the question of authenticity, our discussion has demonstrated the full extent to which frame and inset are fused into one. Whether in conjunction with questions, imperatives, images, and other insets, by means of keyword connections, or through the shape of their *verba dicendi* and the poetic and rhetorical structures around them, prophetic quotations are inseparably tied to their environment and must not be severed from it.

Second, we have witnessed at several places the accuracy of Sternberg's remarks about communicative hierarchy and contextual interference. In 2.23, 2.27, and 3.4, appropriate utterances were transformed by their frames into unacceptable speech. The account of Jerusalem's bloody acts has magnified the audacity of her self-assurance (2.34-35) and the portrayal of her vulgar pursuits has exposed the perversion of her final address (3.1-5). Verbatim quotations differed in their new frames notably from their counterparts (2.6, 27), the *verba dicendi* influenced the meaning of the quoted words (2.6, 8, 23, 35; 3.4), and

nearly all insets were shaped in relation to other insets.

Third, in attending to these core characteristics of integration and framing control, we came to see that each quotation makes a unique functional contribution to its discourse. While the tenets of Clark and Gerrig's demonstrative theory, Wierzbicka's dramatic framework, and the insights of Hebrew narrative critics have been confirmed in our study, these domains do not exhaust the functional range of the quotations in 2.1-3.5. Notable in this regard are those instances which relate to the progression or the discourse, such as the transitional insets in 2.4-9 and 2.23 or the pivotal insets in 2.35.

Fourth, our study has drawn attention to the quotes' place and purpose within the communication structures of their compositions. The insets in 2.1-3.5 play a central role in YHWH's analogies of addressee and referent in 2.4-9 and 2.26-32. Jerusalem's communicative disengagement (2.20-25, 35) and her private speech (3.5a) are crucial for her characterization. The questions of who is quoted, to whom the quotation is directed, and how it relates to other quotations and speeches are critical for an accurate analysis. The analysis of quoted speech always requires an analysis of prophetic discourse.

Fifth, the variety of frame-inset configurations that we have discerned shows that the procedure of analysis must be decided case by case. The peculiarities of the insets have prompted us at times to begin our discussion with their phrasing and syntax (cf. 2.6, 8, 35). In other units, the placement of the quotations has suggested instead a combined reading of frame and inset throughout the progression of the discourse (e.g., 2.20-22; 3.1-5). Elsewhere, such a reading was better suited subsequent to our analysis of the respective parts of a unit (e.g., 2.26-32). This hermeneutical openness reflects the unique interplay between the part and the whole that governs every frame-inset

relationship.

While there are other dimensions which we might add, such as the deixis of the quoted words or the speech proportions between frame and inset, this compilation substantiates the interpretive program that our study advances. The phenomenon of one speaker quoting another speaker cannot be separated into its respective components. It is defined by and operates through contextual integration and interference and presents a unique relationship of two separate, yet intertwined pieces of discourse. Every taxonomy, every category, and every attempt to systematize speech quotations will impoverish the unique contribution of these deliberate insertions.

Wolff's antithesis and the diverse domains advanced by Clark, Crenshaw, and Manahan fall short of encapsulating the various forms and functions of quoted speech. In the end, context triumphs over categories, and every scenario of frame meeting inset must be approached and appreciated on its own terms. Correspondingly, the dominant quest for authentic utterances disregards the definition and dynamics of the phenomenon. Like the once dominant question "Did the prophet really say this?,"<sup>1</sup> the derivative question "Did the people really say this?" should be left aside in lieu of a careful study of quotation in context. The same way in which the multi-faceted discourse of 2.1-3.5 needs to be unshackled from the one-dimensional strictures of marital or cultic interpretations, its speech quotations likewise must be freed from the narrow perception of thesis-antithesis and the black-and-white dichotomy of authenticity. If the phenomenon is understood on its own terms and if its dynamics are adequately recognized, the temptation to systematize will give way to the careful analysis that the interplay of frame and inset demands. As

---

1. For a critique of the prevailing quest for the prophet's *ipsissima verba*, see, e.g., Biddle, *Polyphony*, pp. 115, 128; Diamond, *Confessions*, pp. 124, 189-191; Henderson, "Composition," pp. 118-122.

Sternberg has it, “even the listing of so-called forms and devices and configurations is no substitute for the proper business of reading.”<sup>2</sup>

---

2. *Poetics*, p. 2.



## Bibliography

- Abel, Douglas S. "The Marriage Metaphor in Hosea 4 and Jeremiah 2: How Prophetic Speech 'Kills Two Birds with One Stone.'" *Proceedings* 29 (2009): 15-27.
- Abma, R. *Bonds of Love: Methodic Studies of Prophetic Texts with Marriage Imagery: Isaiah 50.1-3 and 54.1-10, Hosea 1-3, Jeremiah 2-3*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1999.
- Ackerman, Susan. *Under Every Green Tree: Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 46; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Adams, Jim W. *The Performative Nature and Function of Isaiah 40-55*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 448. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Albertz, Rainer. "Jer 2-6 und die Frühzeitverkündigung Jeremias." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 25-34.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- Austin, J. L. *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Bailey, Kenneth E., and Holladay. "The 'Young Camel' and 'Wild Ass' in Jer. II 23-25." *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 256-260.
- Banfield, Ann. "Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech." *Foundations of Language* 10 (1973): 1-39.
- . *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. 3rd ed. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Barstad, Hans M. "HBL als Bezeichnung der fremden Götter im Alten Testament und der Gott Hubal." *Studia Theologica* 32 (1978): 57-65.
- . "No Prophets? Recent Developments in Biblical Prophetic Research and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 57 (1993): 39-60.
- . "The Future of the 'Servant Songs': Some Reflections on the Relationship of Biblical Scholarship to its own Tradition." Pages 261-270 in *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr*. Festschrift James Barr. Edited by Samuel E. Balentine and John Barton. London: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . *The Religious Polemics of Amos: Studies in the Preaching of Am 2.7b-8; 4.1-13; 5.1-27; 6.4-7; 8.14*. *Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series* 34.



- Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, ed. *Critique Textuelle de l'ancien Testament: Volume 2 - Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 50.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Berlin, Adele. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Biddle, Mark E. *A Redaction History of Jeremiah 2.1-4.2*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 77. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1990.
- . *Polyphony and Symphony in Prophetic Literature: Rereading Jeremiah 7-20*. Studies in Old Testament Interpretation 2. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996.
- . "The Figure of Lady Jerusalem: Identification, Deification, and Personification of Cities in the Ancient Near East." Pages 173-187 in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective: Scripture in Context IV*. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 11. Edited by K. Younger Jr., K. Lawson, William W. Hallo, and Bernard F. Batto. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1991.
- Blank, Sheldon. "Irony by Way of Attribution." *Semitics* 1 (1970): 1-6.
- Blayney, Benjamin. *Jeremiah and Lamentations*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Oliphant & Balfour, 1810.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 40-55*. Anchor Bible 19. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Boadt, Lawrence. *Jeremiah 1-25*. Old Testament Message Series 9. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982.
- Böckler, Annette. *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Gottesbildes*. 2nd ed. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 2002.
- Böhler, Dieter. "Geschlechterdifferenz und Landbesitz: Strukturuntersuchungen zu Jer 2.2-4.2." Pages 91-127 in *Jeremia und die "Deuteronomistische Bewegung"*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 98. Edited by Walter Gross. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995.
- Bosworth, David A. "The Tears of God in the Book of Jeremiah." *Biblica* 94 (2013): 24-46.
- Bozak, Barbara A. *Life "Anew": A Literary-Theological Study of Jer. 30-31*. Analecta Biblica 122. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- . "Heeding the Received Text: Jer 2.20a, A Case in Point" *Biblica* 77 (1996): 524-537.
- Bright, John. *Jeremiah*. Anchor Bible 21; New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Brown, F., S. Driver, C. Briggs. *Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile and Homecoming*. Grand

- Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "Israel's Sense of Place." Pages 149-165 in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 1. Edited by J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler. Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick, 1974.
- . "Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 358-374.
- Burnett, Joel S. "Changing Gods: An Exposition of Jeremiah 2." *Review and Expositor* 101 (2004): 289-299.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Prophet Jeremiah and Lamentations: Volume I*. Translated by John Owen. Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1850.
- Carmichael, Callum. "A Ceremonial Crux: Removing a Man's Sandal as a Female Gesture of Contempt." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 321-336.
- Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Construction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Carroll, Robert P. *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1986.
- . "The Polyphonic Jeremiah: A Reading of the Book of Jeremiah." Pages 77-85 in *Reading the Book of Jeremiah: A Search for Coherence*. Edited by Martin Kessler. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- Cha, Jun-Hee. *Micha und Jeremia*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 107. Weinheim: Betz Athenäum, 1996.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Speech-Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58 (2005): 375-392.
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 21.10-34.12*. Word Biblical Commentary 6B. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2002.
- Christensen, Niels E. "The Alleged Distinction between Use and Mention." *The Philosophical Review* 76 (1967): 358-367.
- Clark, Douglas R. "The Citations in the Book of Ezekiel: An Investigation into Method, Audience, and Message." Ph. D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1984.
- Clark, Herbert H., and Richard J. Gerrig. "Quotations as Demonstrations." *Language* 66 (1990): 764-805.
- Clements, R. E. *Jeremiah*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta, GA: Westminster John Knox Press, 1988.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Proverbs: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 10 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Cloete, Walter T. W. *Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah 2-25: Syntactical*

- Constraints in Hebrew Colometry*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 117. Atlanta: GA: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Cohen, Menachem, ed. *Miqra'ot Gedolot "Haketer" Jeremiah*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2012.
- Collins, Terence. *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetic Books*. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1993.
- Condamin, Albert. *Le Livre de Jérémie*. Paris: Gabala, 1936.
- Cornill, Carl Heinrich. *Das Buch Jeremia*. Leipzig: Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz, 1905.
- Coulmas, Florian, ed. *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Trends in Linguistics 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- . "Reported Speech: Some General Issues." Pages 1-28 in *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Trends in Linguistics 3. Edited by Florian Coulmas. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- Craigie, Peter C., Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard. *Jeremiah 1-25*. Word Biblical Commentary 26. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1991.
- Craig Jr., Kenneth M. "Bargaining in Tov (Judges 11.4-11): The Many Directions of So-called Direct Speech." *Biblica* 79 (1998): 76-85.
- Crenshaw, James L. "Popular Questioning of the Justice of God in Ancient Israel." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 82 (1970): 380-395.
- . *Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971.
- Dahood, M. Review of Gerald J. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. *Biblica* 56 (1975): 429-431.
- Daniels, Dwight R. "Is there a 'Prophetic Lawsuit' Genre?" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 339-360.
- Day, John. "Hosea and the Baal Cult." Pages 202-224 in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 531. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Dempster, Stephen. "The Deuteronomic Formula *KÎ YIMMĀṢĒ* in the Light of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Law: An Evaluation of David Daube's Theory." *Revue Biblique* 91 (1984): 188-211.
- Diamond, A. R. Pete. "Interlocutions: The Poetics of Voice in the Figuration of YHWH and his Oracular Agent, Jeremiah." *Interpretation* 62 (2008): 48-65.
- . *The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context: Scenes of Prophetic Drama*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 45. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.
- Diamond, A. R. Pete, and Kathleen M. O'Connor. "Unfaithful Passions: Coding Women Coding Men in Jeremiah 2-3 (4.2)." Pages 123-145 in *Troubling Jeremiah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

260. Edited by A. R. Pete Diamond, Kathleen M. O'Connor, and Louis Stulman. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Diamond, A. R. Pete, Kathleen M. O'Connor, and Louis Stulman, eds. *Troubling Jeremiah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 260. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Diewert, David A. "Job 7.12: *Yam, Tannin* and the Surveillance of Job." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 211-215.
- Dille, Sarah J. *Mixing Metaphors: God as Mother and Father in Deutero-Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 398. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Duhm, Bernard. *Das Buch Jeremia*. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1901.
- Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel. Viertes Band: Jesaja, Jeremia*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1912.
- Elliger, Karl, and Rudolph, Wilhelm, eds. *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensis*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Eugene, Ulrich, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Fischer, Georg. *Der Prophet wie Mose: Studien zum Jeremiabuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 15. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.
- . "Ich Mache Dich. . . zur Eisernen Säule (Jer 1.18): Der Prophet als Besserer Ersatz für den Untergegangenen Tempel." *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 116 (1994): 447-450.
- . *Jeremia 1-25*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2005.
- . *Jeremia 26-52*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2005.
- . "Jeremia und die Psalmen." Pages 469-478 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 238. Edited by Erich Zenger. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- . *Stand der Theologischen Diskussion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007.
- Finsterbusch, Karin. "MT-Jer 1.1-3.5 und LXX-Jer 1.1-3.5: Kommunikationsebenen und Rhetorische Strukturen." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 56 (2012): 247-263.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Repr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Fitzgerald, Aloysius. "BTWLT and BT as Titles for Capital Cities," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 167-183.

- . "The Mythological Background for the Presentation of Jerusalem as a Queen and False Worship as Adultery in the OT." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 34 (1972): 403-416.
- Flynn, Shawn W. *YHWH is King: The Development of Divine Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 159. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Foreman, Benjamin A. *Animal Metaphors and the People of Israel in the Book of Jeremiah*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 238. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Foster, Julia A. "The Motherhood of God: The Use of *hyl* as God-Language in the Hebrew Scriptures." Pages 93-102 in *Uncovering Ancient Stones: Essays in Memory of H. Neil Richardson*. Edited by Lewis M. Hopfe. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Fox, Michael V. "Jeremiah 2.2 and the 'Desert Ideal.'" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (1973): 441-450.
- . *Qohelet and his Contradictions*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- . "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 416-431.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *Jeremiah*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.
- Friedrich, Johannes. "Die Partikeln der Zitierten Rede im Achaemenidischen-Elamischen." *Orientalia* 12 (1943): 23-30.
- Galambush, Julie. *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 130. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Gerardi, Pamela. "Thus, he spoke: Direct Speech in Esarhaddon's Royal Inscriptions." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 79 (1989): 245-260.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius Hebrew Grammar*. Edited and revised by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Minola, NY: Dover Publications, 2006.
- Gesundheit, Shimon. "The Question of LXX Jeremiah as a Tool for Literary-Critical Analysis." *Vetus Testamentum* 62 (2012): 29-57.
- Giesebrecht, F. *Das Buch Jeremia*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894.
- Giménez-Rico, Enrique S. "Encontrar a Yahveh sin Salir a Buscarlo." *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 82 (2007): 461-490.
- Glanz, Oliver. *Understanding Participant-Reference Shifts in the Book of Jeremiah: A Study of Exegetical Method and its Consequences for the Interpretation of Referential Incoherence*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Goerg, Manfred. "'Tachpanhes': Eine Prominente Judäische Adresse in Ägypten." *Biblische Notizen* 97 (1999): 24-30.

- Goldingay, John, and David Payne. *Isaiah 40-55: Volume II*. International Critical Commentary; London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Good, Edwin M. *Irony in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Gordis, Robert. *Koheleth, The Man and his World: A Study of Ecclesiastes*. 3rd ed. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- . "Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 22 (1949): 157–219.
- . "Quotations in Wisdom Literature." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 30 (1939): 123–47.
- . *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- . "Virtual Quotations in Job, Sumer and Qumran." *Vetus Testamentum* 31 (1981): 410–427.
- Gordon, Robert P. "Dialogue and Disputation in the Targum to the Prophets." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 39 (1994): 7–17.
- Graffy, Adrian. *A Prophet Confronts his People: The Disputation Speech in the Prophets*. Analecta Biblica 104. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1984.
- Grossberg, Daniel. "Noun/Verb Parallelism: Syntactic or Asyntactic." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 486–487.
- Gunkel, Herrmann. *Die Propheten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.
- . "Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter." Pages lxvii–lxviii in *Die Großen Propheten*. 2d ed. Edited by Hans Schmidt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923.
- Güldemann, Tom, and Manfred von Roncador, eds. *Reported Discourse: A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains*. Typological Studies in Language 52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002.
- Habel, Norman C. "Appeal to Ancient Tradition as a Literary Form." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 253–272.
- Hardmeier, Christoph. "Die Redekomposition Jer 2-6: Eine Ultimative Verwarnung Jerusalems im Kontext des Zidkijasaufstandes." *Wort und Dienst* 21 (1991): 11–42.
- . "Geschichte und Erfahrung in Jer 2-6: Zur Theologischen Notwendigkeit einer Geschichts- und Erfahrungsbezogenen Exegese und ihrer Methodischen Neuorientierung." *Evangelische Theologie* 56 (1996): 3–29.
- . "Probleme der Textsyntax, der Redeeinbettung und der Abschnittsgliederung in Jer 32 mit ihren kompositionsgeschichtlichen

Konsequenzen." Pages 49-79 in *Syntax und Text. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament* 40. Edited by H. Irsigler. St. Ottilien: Editions Sankt Ottilien, 1993.

Harper, Rober Francis, ed. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum*. 14 vols. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1892-1914.

Hayes, Elizabeth. "'Hearing Jeremiah': Perception and Cognition in Jeremiah 1.1-2.2." *Hebrew Studies* 45 (2004): 99-119.

———. *The Pragmatics of Perception and Cognition in MT Jeremiah 1.1-6.30: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 380. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Hayward, Robert. *The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 12. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

Held, Moshe. "Rhetorical Questions in Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew." *Eretz-Israel* 9 (1969): 71-79.

Henderson, Joseph M. "Jeremiah 2-10 as a Unified Literary Composition: Evidence of Dramatic Portrayal and Narrative Progression." Pages 116-152 in *Uprooting and Planting: Essays on Jeremiah for Leslie Allen*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 459. Edited by John Goldingay. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

———. "Who Weeps in Jeremiah viii 23 (ix 1)? Identifying Dramatic Speakers in the Poetry of Jeremiah." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002): 191-206.

Herrmann, Siegfried. *Jeremia*. Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament 12/2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.

———. "Jeremia 3: Der Inhalt und seine Form." Pages 209-221 in *Ich bewirke das Heil und erschaffe das Unheil (Jesaja 45.7): Studien zur Botschaft der Propheten* (Festschrift Lothar Ruppert. Forschung zur Bibel 88. Edited by F. Diedrich and B. Wilmes. Würzburg: Echter, 1998.

———. "Jeremia: Der Prophet und die Verfasser des Buches Jeremia." Pages 197-214 in *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission*. Rev. ed. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 54. Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.

Hertzberg, H. W. "Jeremia und das Nordreich Israel." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 77 (1952): 595-601.

Hildebrandt, Samuel. "The Proof-and-Play of Quoted Speech in the Joseph Story." In *Doubling and Duplicating in the Book of Genesis*. Edited by Elizabeth Hayes and Karolien Vermeuyn. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, forthcoming.

———. "The Servants of Saul: 'Minor' Characters and Royal Commentary in 1 Samuel 9-31." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 40 (2015): 179-200.

Hill, John. *Friend Or Foe? The Figure of Babylon in the Book of Jeremiah MT*.

Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Hillers, Delbert R. "A Convention in Hebrew Literature: The Reaction to Bad News." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77 (1965): 86-90.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Micah*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1984.

Hitzig, Ferdinand. *Der Prophet Jeremia*. 2d ed. Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 3. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1866.

Hobbs, T. R. "Jeremiah 3.1-5 and Deuteronomy 24.1-4." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 23-29.

Hoffmann, Yair. "Jeremiah 2.30," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 418-420.

Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Reprinted ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jeremiah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jeremiah II 34b $\beta$ : A Fresh Approach." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 221-225.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Every High Hill and Under Every Green Tree." *Vetus Testamentum* 11 (1961): 170-176.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Architecture of Jeremiah 1-20*. London: Associated University Presses, 1976.

Holt, Else K. "The Fountation of Living Water and the Deceitful Brook: The Pool of Water Metaphors in the Book of Jeremiah (MT)." Pages 99-117 in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 187. Edited by Pierre van Hecke. Leuven: University Press, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Helpless Potentate: A Neglected Image in Jeremiah." Pages 179-191 in *The Centre and the Periphery: A European Tribute to Walter Brueggemann*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 27. Edited by Jill Middlemas, David J. A. Clines, and Else K. Holt. Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2010.

Horwitz, William J. "Audience Reaction to Jeremiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 555-564.

Houston, Walter. "What did the Prophets think they were doing? Speech Acts and Prophetic Discourse in the Old Testament." *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* 1 (1993): 167-188.

Hubman, F. D. "Bemerkungen zur Älteren Diskussion um die Unterschiede zwischen MT und G im Jeremiabuch." Pages 263-270 in *Jeremia und die "Deuteronomistische Bewegung"*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 98. Edited by Walter Gross. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 285-295.



- Hyatt, J. Philip. "Torah in the Book of Jeremiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 60 (1941): 384-387.
- Jacobson, Rolf A. *Many Are Saying: The Function of Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Psalter*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 397. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Janssen, Theo A. J. M., and Wim van der Wurff, eds. *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Pragmatics & Beyond 43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996.
- Janzen, Gerald J. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1973.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, eds. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 3 vols. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jobling, D. "Jeremiah's Poem in III1-IV2." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 45-55.
- Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia Biblica 14. 2 vols. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.
- Joyce, Paul M. "Individual Responsibility in Ezekiel 18?" Pages 185-196 in *Studia Biblica 1978: I. Papers on Old Testament and Related Themes*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 11. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1979.
- Kammerzell, Frank, and Carsten Peust. "Reported Speech in Egyptian: Forms, Types, and History." Pages 289-322 in *Reported Discourse: A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains*. Typological Studies in Language 52. Edited by Tom Güldemann and Manfred von Roncador. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. "Textual Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah." *Textus* 7 (1969): 36-58.
- Keil, Carl Friedrich. *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jeremia und die Klagelieder*. Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1872.
- Kessler, Martin, ed. *Reading the Book of Jeremiah: A Search for Coherence*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- Kilpp, Nelson. *Niederreißen und Aufbauen: Das Verhältnis von Heilsverheißung und Unheilsverkündigung bei Jeremia und im Jeremiabuch*. Biblical and Theological Studies 13. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Kilunga, Godefroid B. *Prééminence de YHWH ou Autonomie du Prophète: Etude Comparative et Critique des Confessions de Jérémie dans le Texte Hébreu Massorétique et la "Septante"*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 254. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Knobnya, Svetlana. "God the Father in the Old Testament." *European Journal of Theology* 20 (2011): 139-148.

- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Revised by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.
- Korpel, Marjo C. A. "Who is Speaking in Jeremiah 4:19-22? The Contribution of Unit Delimitation to an Old Problem." *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 88-98.
- Krüger, Thomas. "Jahwe und die Götter in Jeremia 2." Pages 181-190 in *Schriftprophetie*. Festschrift Jörg Jeremias. Edited by Friedhelm Hartenstein, Jutta Krispenz, and Aaron Scharf. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Kugel, James L. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Kumaki, F. "A New Look at Jer 4.19-22 and Jer 10.19-21." *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 8 (1982): 113-22.
- Labuschagne, C. F. "Amos's Conception of God and the Popular Theology of his Time." Pages 122-133 in *Studies in the Books of Hosea and Amos: Paper Read at the 7th and 8th Meetings of Die O. T. Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Africa*. Edited by A. H. van Zyl. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege, 1964-1965.
- . "The Emphasizing Particle GAM and its Connotations." Pages 193-203 in *Studia Biblica et Semitica*. Festschrift Th. Ch. Vriezen. Edited by W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude. Wageningen: Veenman en Zonen, 1966.
- Lallemann-deWinkel, H. *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Lane-Mercier, Gilian. "Quotation as a Discursive Strategy." *Kodikas/Code Ars Semeiotica* 14 (1991): 199-214.
- Levin, Christoph. *Die Verheißung des Neuen Bundes in ihrem Theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 137. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Lewy, Julius. "The Old West Semitic Sun-God Hammu." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 18 (1943): 429-488.
- Limburg, J. "The Root ריב and Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 291-304.
- Liwak, Rüdiger. *Der Prophet und die Geschichte: Eine Literar-historische Untersuchung zum Jeremiabuch*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 121. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987.
- Loewenclau, Ilse von. "Zu Jeremia II 30." *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1966): 117-23.
- Long, Burke O. "Stylistic Components of Jeremiah 3.1-5." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 386-390.

- . "Two Question and Answer Schemata in the Prophets." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 129-139.
- Longman, Tremper III. *Proverbs*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Lopazzo, Vincenzo. "Ger 3: Forma, Contentu e Scopo." *Bibbia e Oriente* 43 (2001): 197-213.
- Low, Maggie. *Mother Zion in Deutero-Isaiah: A Metaphor for Zion Theology*. Studies in Biblical Literature 155. New York: Peter Lang, 2013.
- Lundbom, Jack R. "Haplography in the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Jeremiah." *Hebrew Studies* 46 (2005): 301-320.
- . *Jeremiah 1-20*. Anchor Bible 21A. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- . *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 18. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975.
- . Review of Biddle, *A Redaction History of Jeremiah 2.1-4.2*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 515-17.
- Lust, Johan. "Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel." Pages 83-92 in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuaginta and Cognate Studies 52. Edited by Adrian Schenker. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2003.
- Maier, Christl. *Die "fremde Frau" in Proverbien 1-9: Eine Exegetische und Sozialgeschichtliche Studie*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 144. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1995.
- Manahan, Ronald E. "An Interpretive Survey: Audience Reaction Quotations in Jeremiah." *Grace Theological Journal* 1 (1980): 163-183.
- . "A Theology of Pseudoprophets: A Study in Jeremiah." *Grace Theological Journal* 1 (1980): 80-83.
- Marcos, N. F. *The Septuagint in Context: An Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Martin, J. D. "The Forensic Background to Jeremiah 3.1." *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 82-92.
- Mauser, U. *Gottesbild und Menschwerdung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Mays, James L. "The Centre of the Psalms." Pages 231-246 in *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr*. Festschrift James Barr. Edited by Samuel E. Balentine and John Barton. London: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- McCarthy, C. *The Tiqqune Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- McConville, J. Gordon. *Deuteronomy*. Apollos Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.

- . “Divine Speech and the Book of Jeremiah.” Pages 18-38 in *The Trustworthiness of God*. Edited by Paul Helm and Carl Trueman. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- . *Judgment and Promise: An Interpretation of the Book of Jeremiah*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- McKane, William. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah: Volume I*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.
- . “SPY(Y)M with Special Reference to the Book of Jeremiah.” Pages 319-335 in *Mélanges Bibliques et Orientaux en l’honneur de M. Henri Conzelles*. Festschrift M. Henri Conzelles. *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 212. Edited by A. Caquot and M. Delcor. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Meier, Samuel A. *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Merwe, Christo H. J. van der, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Biblical Language: Hebrew 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Merwe, Christo H. J. van der. “Another Look at the Biblical Hebrew Focus Particle ׀.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 54 (2009): 313-332.
- Meyer, Ivo. *Jeremia und die Falschen Propheten*. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Miglio, Adam. “Ordeal, Infidelity, and Prophetic Irony in Jeremiah 2.1-9.” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 24 (2010): 222-234.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 17-22*. Anchor Bible 3A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Miller, Cynthia L. *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Miller, Patrick D. *The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. New Interpreter’s Bible 6. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2001.
- Min, Y.-J. “The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins.” Ph. D. diss., Hebrew University Jerusalem, 1977.
- Moshavi, Adina. “Two Types of Argumentation Involving Rhetorical Questions in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue.” *Biblica* 90 (2009): 32-46.
- Moughtin-Mumby, Sharon. *Sexual and Marital Metaphors in Hosea, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and Ezekiel*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Muraoka, T. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985.
- Murphy, Roland E. *Proverbs*. Word Biblical Commentary 22. Nashville, TN:

- Thomas Nelson, 1998.
- Murray, D. F. "The Rhetoric of Disputation: Re-examination of a Prophetic Genre." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38 (1987): 95-121.
- Nägelsbach, C. W. Eduard. *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Theologically and Homiletically Expounded*. Translated by Samuel R. Asbury. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1886.
- Neef, Heinz-Dieter. "Gottes Treue und Israel's Untreue: Aufbau und Einheit von Jeremia 2.2-13." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 39-40.
- Nicholson, E. W. *Jeremiah 1-25*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Nielsen, Kirsten. *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1978.
- Noble, Paul R. "Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation." *Journal of Literature & Theology* 7 (1993): 130-147.
- Nötscher, Friedrich. *Das Buch Jeremias*. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1934.
- Noh, Eun-Ju. *Metarepresentation: A Relevance-Theory Approach*. Pragmatics & Beyond 69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.
- O'Brien, Julia M. "Judah as Wife and Husband: Deconstructing Gender in Malachi." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 241-250.
- Olyan, Saul M. "The Cultic Confessions of Jer 2.27a." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 254-259.
- Ortlund Jr., Raymond C. *God's Unfaithful Wife: A Biblical Theology of Spiritual Adultery*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 2. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*. New International Commentary on Old Testament Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Overholt, Thomas W. "Jeremiah 2 and the Problem of 'Audience Reaction.'" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 262-273.
- Parke-Taylor, Geoffrey H. *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah: Doublets and Recurring Phrases*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2000.
- Partee, Barbara H. "The Syntax and Semantics of Quotation." Pages 410-418 in *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. Festschrift Morris Halle. Edited by Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky. New York: Holt, 1973.
- Parunak, H. Van Dyke. "Some Discourse Functions of Prophetic Quotation Formulas in Jeremiah." Pages 489-519 in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Edited by Robert D. Bergen; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Peake, A. S. *Jeremiah: Vol. I Jeremiah I-XXIV*. The Century Bible. Edinburgh: T&T

- Clark, 1910.
- Perdue, Leo G. *Proverbs*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.
- Petersen, David L., and Kent H. Richards. *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1992.
- Pinker, Aron. "On the Meaning of *šgl*." *Jewish Studies an Internet Journal* 8 (2009): 167-182.
- Plöger, Otto. *Sprüche Salomos*. 2nd ed. Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003.
- Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich. *Die Ferne Gottes: Studien zum Jeremiabuch: Beiträge zu den "Konfessionen" im Jeremiabuch und ein Versuch zur Frage nach den Anfängen der Jeremiatradition*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 179. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 19-40*. Anchor Bible 2A. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Recanati, François. "Open Quotations Revisited." *Philosophical Perspectives* 22 (2008): 443-471.
- Redeker, Gisela. "Quotation in Discourse." Pages 341-355 in *Artikeln van de Eerste Sociolinuïstische Conferentie*. Edited by Roeland van Hout and Erica Huls. Delft: Eburon, 1991.
- Regt, Lénart de. "Discourse Implications of Rhetorical Questions in Job, Deuteronomy, and the Minor Prophets." Pages 64-76 in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Lénart de Regt, J. de Waard, and J. P. Fokkelman. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- . "Person Shift in Prophetic Texts: Its Function and its Rendering in Ancient and Modern Translations." Pages 214-231 in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist*. Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap 45. Edited by J. C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill.
- Reimer, David J. *The Oracles Against Babylon in Jeremiah 50-51: A Horror Among the Nations*. San Francisco, CA: Edwin Mellen, 1993.
- Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Riede, Peter. *Ich Mache Dich zur Festen Stadt: Zum Prophetenbild von Jeremia 1.18f und 15.20*. Forschung zur Bibel 121. Würzburg: Echter, 2009.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Motif of the Weeping God in Jeremiah and its Background in the Lament Tradition of the Ancient Near East." *Old Testament Essays* 5 (1992): 361-74.
- Roche, Michael de. "Israel's 'Two Evils' in Jeremiah 2.13." *Vetus Testamentum* 31 (1981): 369-371.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Yahweh's *rîb* against Israel: A Reassessment of the so-called 'Prophetic Lawsuit' in the Preexilic Prophets." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 563-574.
- Rofé, Alexander. "The Arrangement of the Book of Jeremiah." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101 (1989): 390-398.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Name ŠĒBĀ'ÔT and the Shorter Recension of Jeremiah." Pages 307-316 in *Prophetie und Geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im Alten Israel*. FS Herrmann. Edited by Rüdiger Liwak and S. Wagner. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991.
- Rom-Shiloni, Dalit. *God in Times of Destruction and Exiles: Tanakh (Hebrew Bible) Theology*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2009. Hebrew title: אלהים בעידן של חורבן וגלויות תאולוגיה תנ"כית.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'How can you say, 'I am not defiled. . .?'" (Jeremiah 2.20-25): Allusion to Priestly Legal Traditions in the Poetry of Jeremiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133 (2014): 757-775.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Jeremia*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 1st Reihe, 12. Tübingen: Mohr, 1947.
- Ryken, Leland, James C. Wilhoit, and Tremper Longman III, eds. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.
- Saka, Paul. "Quotation and Conceptions of Language." *Dialectica* 65 (2011): 205-220.
- Savran, George W. *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University, 1988.
- Schabert, J. "Jeremia und die Reform des Joschija." Pages 40-57 in *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission*. Rev. ed. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 54. Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Schmid, Konrad. *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30-33 im Kontext des Buches*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 72. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996.
- Schmidt, Hans, ed. *Die Großen Propheten*. 2nd ed. Edited by Hans Schmidt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923.
- Schmidt, Werner H. *Das Buch Jeremiah: Kapitel 1-20*. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Geht doch und schaut!' Aufrufe, sich selbst zu überzeugen, im Jeremiabuch." Pages 229-238 in *Gottes Recht als Lebensraum*. Festschrift Hans J. Boecker. Edited by Peter Mommer, Werner H. Schmidt, and Hans Strauß. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993.
- Schmitt, John J. "Israel and Zion: Two Gendered Images: Biblical Speech Traditions and their Contemporary Neglect." *Horizons* 18 (1991): 18-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gender of Ancient Israel." *Journal for the Study of the Old*

- Testament* 26 (1983): 115-125.
- . "The Virgin of Israel : Referent and Use of the Phrase in Amos and Jeremiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53 (1991): 365-380.
- Schnutenhaus, Frank. "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76 (1964): 1-22.
- Schökel, Luis Alonso. *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*. Subsidia Biblica 11. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988.
- Schottroff, Willy. "Jeremia 2.1-3: Erwägungen zur Methode der Prophetenexegese." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 67 (1970): 263-294.
- . "*Gedenken*" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament: Die Wurzel *Zākar* im Semitischen Sprachkreis. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 15. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1964.
- Schulz-Rauch, Martin. *Hosea und Jeremia: Zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Hoseabuches*. Calwer Theologische Monographien, Reihe A: Bibelwissenschaft 16. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1996.
- Schultz, Richard L. *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 180. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Scott, R. B. Y. *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes*. Anchor Bible 18. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Seitz, Christopher R. "Isaiah 1-66: Making Sense of the Whole." Pages 105-123 in *Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Seitz. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.
- . "The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101 (1989): 18-27.
- Selms, A. van. "Telescoped Discussion as a Literary Device in Jeremiah." *Vetus Testamentum* 26 (1976): 99-112.
- Seymour, Michel. "Indirect Discourse and Quotation." *Philosophical Studies* 74 (1994): 1-38.
- Shead, Andrew G. *A Mouth Full of Fire: The Word of God in the words of Jeremiah*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 29. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2012.
- . *The Open Book and the Sealed Book: Jeremiah 32 in its Hebrew and Greek Recensions*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 347. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Shields, Mary E. *Circumscribing the Prostitute: The Rhetorics of Intertextuality, Metaphor, and Gender in Jeremiah 3.1-4.4*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 387. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Sienstra, Nelly. *YHWH is the Husband of his People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation*. Kampen: Kok Pharos,



1993.

Soderlund, Sven. *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 47. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1985.

Soggin, J. "Einige Bemerkungen über Jeremias II, 34." *Vetus Testamentum* 8 (1958): 433-435.

Sohn, Seock-Tae. *YHWH, The Husband of Israel: The Metaphor of Marriage between YHWH and Israel*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2002.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Steck, Odil H. "Zion als Gelände und Gestalt: Überlegungen zur Wahrnehmung Jerusalems als Stadt und Frau im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 86 (1989): 261-281.

Sternberg, Meir. "How Indirect Discourse Means: Syntax, Semantics, Poetics, Pragmatics." Pages 62-83 in *Literary Pragmatics*. Edited by Roger D. Sell. London: Routledge, 1991.

———. "Point of View and the Indirections of Direct Speech." *Language and Style* 15 (1982): 67-117.

———. "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse." *Poetics Today* 3 (1982): 107-156.

———. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Stiebert, Johanna. *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible: The Prophetic Contribution*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 346. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

Strawn, Brent A. *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 212. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005.

Streane, A. W. *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah together with the Lamentations*. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1892.

Stulman, Louis. *Jeremiah*. Apollos Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2005.

Suganuma, Eiji. "Jeremiah Chapter 2: A Form-critical and Theological Study." Ph. D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1971.

Sweeney, Marvin A. "Differing Perspectives in the LXX and MT Versions of Jeremiah 1-10." Pages 135-153 in *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception of Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 89. Edited by Sweeney. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

———. "Structure and Redaction in Jeremiah 2-6." Pages 200-219 in *Troubling Jeremiah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Sup 260. Edited by Pete A. R. Diamond, Kathleen M. O'Connor, and Louis Stulman.

- Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Tannen, Deborah. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Thiel, Winfried. *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 41. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.
- . Review of Biddle, *A Redaction History of Jeremiah 2.1-4.2*. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 116 (1991): 104-105.
- Thompson, J. A. *The Book of Jeremiah*. New International Commentary on Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. "Giving Voice to Malachi's Interlocutors." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 19 (2005): 173-192.
- . *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage: Post-exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2te Reihe, 19. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- . "The Priests and the Temple Cult in the Book of Jeremiah." Pages 233-264 in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 388. Edited by Hans M. Barstad and Reinhard G. Kratz. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy: The JPS Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tooman, Willam A. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scriptural and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38-39*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2te Reihe 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd rev. ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 91 (1979): 73-93.
- . "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah." Pages 145-167 in *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission*. Rev. ed. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 54. Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd rev. ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001.
- . "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of its Textual History." Pages 363-384 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 72. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill 1999.
- Trapp, Thomas. "Jeremiah: The Other Sides of the Story." Pages 228-242 in *Was*

*ist der Mensch. . . ? Beiträge zur Anthropologie des Alten Testaments.*  
Festschrift Hans Walter Wolff. Edited by Frank Crüsemann. München: Chr.  
Kaiser, 1992.

VanGemeren, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament  
Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1997.

Volz, D. Paul. *Der Prophet Jeremia*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 10. Leipzig:  
A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1928.

Waltke, Bruce K. *A Commantary on Micah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.

———. *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15*. New International Commentary  
on Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patrick O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical  
Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Wanke, Gunther. *Jeremia: Teilband 1 (Jeremia 1.1-25.14)*. Züricher  
Bibelkommentare. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1995.

Washington, Corey. "The Identity Theory of Quotation." *Journal of Philosophy* 89  
(1992): 582-605.

Watson, Wilfred G. E. "Abrupt Speech in Ugaritic Narrative Verse." *Ugarit-  
Forschungen* 22 (1990): 415-423.

———. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. Journal for the  
Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Journal for  
the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1984.

———. "Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in the OT." *Journal of  
Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 321-41.

———. "Introductions to Speech in Ugaritic and Hebrew." Pages 383-393 in  
*Ugarit and the Bible*. Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur. Edited by George J.  
Brooke, Adrian H. W. Curtis, and John F. Healey. Münster: Ugarit Verlag,  
1994.

———. "Symmetry of Stanza in Jeremiah 2.2b-3." *Journal for the Study of the  
Old Testament* 19 (1981): 107-110.

Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34-66*. Rev. ed. Word Biblical Commentary 25. Nashville,  
TN: Thomas Nelson, 2000.

Weber, R., and R. Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra Vulgata Editio Quinta*. Stuttgart:  
Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

Weinfeld, M. "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel." *Zeitschrift für  
die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 2-56.

Weiser, Arthur. *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &  
Ruprecht, 1960.

Weisgerber, Jean. "The Use of Quotations in Recent Literature." *Comparative  
Literature* 22 (1970): 36-45.

Wendel, Ute. *Jesaja und Jeremia: Worte, Motive und Einsichten Jesajas in der*

- Verkündigung Jeremias*. Biblical and Theological Studies 25. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.
- Westermann, Claus. *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*. Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie 31. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1960.
- Whybray, R. N. "The Identification and Use of Quotations in Ecclesiastes." Pages 435-351 in *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 32. Edited by J. A. Emerton. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. "The Semantics of Direct and Indirect Discourse." *Papers in Linguistics* 7 (1974): 267-307.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Jahwewort und Prophetische Rede bei Jeremia*. Zürich: Zwingli, 1942.
- Williams, James G. "Irony and Lament: Clues to Prophetic Consciousness." *Semeia* 8 (1977): 51-74.
- Williams, Prescott H. "The Fatal and Foolish Exchange: Living Water for 'Nothings.' A Study of Jeremiah 2.4-13." *Austin Seminary Bulletin* 81 (1965): 3-59.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Edited and revised by John C. Beckman. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Willis, John T. "Dialogue between Prophet and Audience as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Jeremiah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33 (1985): 63-82.
- . "QÛMĀH YHWH." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 16 (1990): 207-221.
- Wischnowsky, Marc. *Tochter Zion: Aufnahme und Überwindung der Stadtklage in den Prophetenschriften des Alten Testaments*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 89. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch: Eine Studie zur Prophetischen Verkündigungsweise." Beiträge zur Evangelische Theologie 4. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1937; reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. Theologische Bücherei 22. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1964, pp. 36-129.
- Woude, A. S. van der. "Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-prophets." *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 244-260.
- Wyatt, N. *Word of Tree and Whisper of Stone: And Other Papers on Ugaritic Thought*. Gorgias Ugaritic Studies 1. Piscataway, NJ: 2007.
- Yates, Gary E. "Jeremiah's Message of Judgment and Hope for God's Unfaithful 'Wife.'" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 167 (2010): 144-165.
- Yindo, Job Y. *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1-24*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 64. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.

- Zahavi-Ely, Naama. "Voice and Persona: The Convention of Changing Speakers in Biblical Hebrew Poetry and its Use in the Book of Jeremiah." Ph. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 2010.
- Zehnder, Markus P. *Wegmetaphorik im Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 268; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis Editum Volume XV: Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Zulick, Margaret D. "The Agon of Jeremiah: On the Dialogic Invention of Prophetic Ethos." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78 (1992): 125-148.